DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 197 222 CE 027 912

AUTHOR	Ball, Joseph: And Others
TITLE	Youth Entitlement Demonstration Program. A Summary Report on the Start-Up Period of the Youth Incentive Pilot Projects, January-June, 1978.
INSTITUTION	Manpower Demonstration Research Corp., New York, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY	Employment and Training Administration (DOL), Washington, D.C. Office of Youth Programs.
PUB DATE	Jan 79
GRANT	DOL-28-36-78-36
NOTE	94p.: For related documents see CE 027 911-914 and ED 176 048.
AVAILABLE FROM	Manpower Demonstration Research Corp., Three Park Ave., New York, NY 10016 (Write for price).
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Demonstration Programs: *Disadvantaged Youth: Dropout Prevention: Dropouts: *Employment Programs: Enrollment: Evaluation Needs: *Federal Programs: Incentives: Job Development: *Pilot Projects: Program Costs: *Program Design: Program Development: Program Evaluation: Program Implementation: Research Needs: Secondary Education: Student Recruitment: *Youth Employment
IDENTIFIERS	Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act: *Youth Incentive Entitlement Pilot Projects

ABSTRACT

The Youth Incentive Entitlement Pilot Projects were set up to aid disadvantaged youths, ages 16 to 19, guaranteeing them a part-time job during the school year and a full-time job during summer months on the condition that they remain in, or return to, a secondary school or enroll in an equivalency education program. It was started in January, 1978, and currently enrolls about 30,000 youths in 17 sites across the country. This report, covering the period from January through June, 1978, summarizes program start-up issues and characteristics of the first group of enrollees. It is divided into six sections. Section 1 introduces the project and provides background information on the Youth Entitlement Program, while section 2 describes the characteristics of the participating youths. Sections 3 and 4 describe the program start-up, recruitment and enrollment of youth, job development, and worksites; and section 5 proposes the research and evaluation efforts that will be needed to gain information about the projects in order to better serve youth needs in the future and details the reports that are expected to evolve from the program. Section 6 focuses on cost of the program. Each of the 17 pilot project sites are described in the appendix to the report. (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED197222

THE YOUTH ENTITLEMENT DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM

A Summary Report on the Start-Up Period of The Youth Incentive Entitlement Pilot Projects

January - June, 1978

Manpower Demonstration
Research Corporation

January, 1979

CE027912

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

S. E. Mandel

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

This report was prepared pursuant to the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act of 1977 (PL 95-93), Title III, Part C, "Youth Incentive Entitlement Pilot Projects."

Funding for this national demonstration comes from the Office of Youth Programs, of the Employment and Training Administration of the U.S. Department of Labor under Grant No. 28-36-78-36 from the Office of Research and Development of ETA.

Researchers undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment. Therefore, points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent the official position or policy of the Federal Government sponsors of the demonstration.

Copyright 1979 by Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

OF THE

MANPOWER DEMONSTRATION RESEARCH CORPORATION

Eli Ginzberg, Chairman
Director
Conservation of Human Resources
Columbia University

Robert Solow, Vice-Chairman
Institute Professor
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Richard Nathan, Secretary-Treasurer
Senior Fellow
Brookings Institution

Bernard E. Anderson
Professor of Industry
University of Pennsylvania

Anthony Downs
Senior Fellow
Brookings Institution

M. Carl Holman
President
National Urban Coalition

Alan Kistler
Director of Organization and Field Services
AFL-CIO

Robert Lampman
Professor
Department of Economics
University of Wisconsin

Gilbert Steiner
Senior Fellow
Brookings Institution

Phyllis A. Wallace
Professor
Alfred P. Sloan School of Management
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Nan Waterman
Chairwoman
Common Cause

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Contributing to the writing and editing of this report were a number of MDRC staff including: Joseph Ball, Delia Council, William Diaz, Frank Donaldson, Joanne Hayes, Joan Leiman, Katherine Logue, Vivian Manning, Kenneth McNutt, Susan Motley, Robert Penn, Richard Presha, Kenneth Rice, Vicki Semo, Stephanie Sheber, and Gary Walker. Thomas Seessel was responsible for pulling together information and drafts from the staff and preparing a final draft. Sheila Mandel was responsible for final editing and Suzanne Trazoff oversaw the production of the report. Helpful comments and suggestions on initial drafts were made by several officials from the Office of Youth Programs of the U.S. Department of Labor but the viewpoints expressed are wholly those of MDRC.

PREFACE

Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation (MDRC) was created in 1974 to develop, oversee, and evaluate large-scale, innovative social programs. With the support of both public and private agencies, it is currently overseeing four research/demonstration programs which are testing innovative ideas designed to cope with such problems as unemployment dependency and social disorganization. These programs include: the National Supported Work Demonstration, the National Tenant Management Demonstration, the WIN Laboratories, and the largest of these, the Youth Incentive Entitlement Pilot Projects.

The Entitlement Demonstration, with a current enrollment of approximately 30,000 youths at 17 sites across the country, legislatively establishes a guarantee of work -- part-time during the school year and full-time during the summer -- for disadvantaged youths who live in a community selected for participation, and conditions the guarantee on satisfactory school performance. The model is thus a test of the potential of a work incentive as a means for encouraging and helping youths to complete their high-school education and improve their longer term prospects for employment and post-secondary education.

Local CETA prime sponsors are responsible for establishing a system to enroll youths, arrange the guaranteed job, manage the payroll, and monitor work performance and eligibility criteria. The schooling requirement is monitored by obtaining regular reports on attendance and

performance from regular or alternative schools and Graduate Equivalency Diploma (GED) programs in which the youths are enrolled. The standards for satisfactory attendance and performance are set by an agreement between the schools and the program. The Entitlement approach requires the location and development of enough worthwhile jobs to fill the demand among those who are eligible.

To test the feasibility and usefulness of the Entitlement concept, Congress mandated the design of a comprehensive research and assessment effort. This analysis component of the demonstration is being carried out by MDRC and its subcontractors and is described in more detail in this report.

As one means of gaining new knowledge into the problems of youth unemployment and its relationship to high-school education, the Entitlement Demonstration is intended to further support ongoing innovations and try out promising ideas such as allowing for subsidized employment in the private sector and developing various techniques to improve the linkages between school and work.

This summary report emphasizes program start-up issues and characteristics of the first group of enrollees, and covers the period from January through June, 1978. A previous report on the selection of sites for the demonstration was prepared for the Department of Labor and issued in March, 1978; it is available from MDRC. Information on subsequent phases of the demonstration will be furnished in future reports, with a fuller research report scheduled for March, 1979.

William J. Grinker
President
Manpower Demonstration
Research Corporation

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE		v
LIST OF TABLES		viii
I.	Introduction and Background	1
II.	Characteristics of Participating Youths	9
III.	Program Start-Up, Recruitment and Enrollment	18
IV.	Job Creation and Worksites	28
V.	Research and Evaluation	39
VI.	Funding Entitlement	49
APPENDIX		54

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1	SUMMARY CHARACTERISTICS OF SITES SELECTED FOR PARTICIPATION IN THE YOUTH ENTITLEMENT DEMONSTRATION	
	TIER I	2
	TIER II	3
2	ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS	10
3	CHARACTERISTICS AT TIME OF ENROLLMENT OF YOUTH ENROLLED IN YOUTH ENTITLEMENT DEMONSTRATION THROUGH JUNE 1978, BY TIER	12
4	SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF ENROLLEES IN THE YOUTH ENTITLEMENT DEMONSTRATION THROUGH JUNE 1978 BY TIER AND EDUCATIONAL STATUS IN THE SEMESTER PRIOR TO ENROLLMENT	15
5	SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF YOUTH ENROLLED IN THE YOUTH ENTITLEMENT DEMONSTRATION THROUGH JUNE 1978, BY SITE, TIER I	16
6	SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF YOUTH ENROLLED IN THE YOUTH ENTITLEMENT DEMONSTRATION THROUGH JUNE 1978, BY SITE, TIER II	17
7	RECRUITMENT SOURCE OF ENROLLEES IN THE YOUTH ENTITLEMENT DEMONSTRATION THROUGH JUNE 1978, BY TIER AND EDUCATIONAL STATUS IN THE SEMESTER PRIOR TO ENROLLMENT	24
8	YOUTH ENROLLED AND ASSIGNED TO JOB OR TRAINING IN THE YOUTH ENTITLEMENT DEMONSTRATION THROUGH JUNE 1978 BY SITE	26
9	YOUTH ENROLLED AND ASSIGNED TO JOB OR TRAINING IN THE YOUTH ENTITLEMENT DEMONSTRATION THROUGH JUNE 1978, BY MONTH AND TIER	27
10	ANALYSIS OF JOB ACTIVITY IN THE YOUTH ENTITLEMENT DEMONSTRATION THROUGH JUNE 1978, BY OCCUPATION	32

TABLE		PAGE
11	DISTRIBUTION OF YOUTH WORKING IN THE YOUTH ENTITLEMENT DEMONSTRATION AT THE END OF JUNE 1978, BY OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORY AND SPONSOR TYPE	33
12	DISTRIBUTION OF YOUTH WORKING IN THE YOUTH ENTITLEMENT DEMONSTRATION AT THE END OF JUNE 1978, BY OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORY AND SITE	34
13	DISTRIBUTION OF YOUTH WORKING IN THE FOR-PROFIT SECTOR IN THE YOUTH ENTITLEMENT DEMONSTRATION AT THE END OF JUNE 1978, BY SPONSOR INDUSTRY AND SITE	36
14	DISTRIBUTION OF YOUTH WORKING IN THE FOR-PROFIT SECTOR IN THE YOUTH ENTITLEMENT DEMONSTRATION AT THE END OF JUNE 1978, BY OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORY AND SPONSOR INDUSTRY	37
15	TOTAL SITE BUDGET FOR THE ENTITLEMENT DEMONSTRATION FOR THE PERIOD JANUARY 1, 1978, THROUGH JUNE 30, 1978, BY SITE	50
16	PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF BUDGETED AND ACTUAL SITE EXPENSES IN THE ENTITLEMENT DEMONSTRATION BY MAJOR EXPENSE CATEGORY AND TIER	51
17	TOTAL BUDGETED AND ACTUAL SITE EXPENSES IN THE ENTITLEMENT DEMONSTRATION FOR THE PERIOD JANUARY 1, 1978 THROUGH JUNE 30, 1978, BY SITE	52
18	SUMMARY OF TOTAL EXPENDITURES FOR THE YOUTH ENTITLEMENT DEMONSTRATION FOR THE PERIOD JANUARY 1, 1978 THROUGH JUNE 30, 1978	53
CHART I	SCHEDULE FOR RESEARCH REPORTS	47

I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

The Youth Incentive Entitlement Pilot Projects is unique in American employment and training legislation in that it establishes a guarantee, or "entitlement" to a job to any youth who meets the program's eligibility criteria. Economically-disadvantaged youths aged 16-19 years in 17 designated communities across the country are guaranteed a part-time job during the school year and a full-time job during the summer, provided that they remain in or return to secondary school, or enroll in an equivalency education program. They may participate in the program as long as they maintain standards established for eligibility and performance at school and on the job.

This interim report on the demonstration, deals with implementation of the project in early 1978, recruitment and enrollment, assignment of youths to their worksites, characteristics of enrollees, and other data through June 30, 1978. Accordingly, the report reflects activity only for the school year and not for the summer program.

CETA prime sponsors in the 17 participating locations have oversight responsibility for local program operations. A few have chosen to subcontract the direct management of the program to the local school system or a nonprofit agency, while most run the program directly. The sites and some of their characteristics, are shown in Table 1.

Program Start-Up

The demonstration was designed and launched in an extremely short

TABLE 1

SUMMARY CHARACTERISTICS OF SITES SELECTED FOR
PARTICIPATION IN THE YOUTH ENTITLEMENT DEMONSTRATION

Tier I

Site	DOL Region	Entitlement Area	Unemployment Rate	Racial Composition
Baltimore	III	Four complete high school zones and part of a fifth, encompassing 1/3 of the city	10.3% (1976)[a]	15% White, 85% Non-White (1977)[d]
Boston	I	Four school districts; parts of Dorchester, Roxbury, S. Boston, Mattapan, Hyde Park, Central Boston, Charlestown	9.8% (1977)[b]	81% White, 18% Non-White 3% Hispanic (1970)[b]
Cincinnati	V	Entire City	7.0% (1977)[b]	72% White, 28% Non-White (1970)[b]
Denver	VIII	Entire City	6.9% (1976)[b]	91% White, 9% Non-White 17% Hispanic (1978)[b]
Detroit	V	Attendance zones of five high schools	13.1% (1977)[b]	30% White, 70% Non-White (1977)[d]
King-Snohomish	X	King County and Snohomish County, including the city of Seattle	6.7% (1977)[b]	90% White, 10% Non-White (1979)[b]
Mississippi	IV	Nineteen rural counties located in a belt across the state between the City of Jackson and the Gulf of Mexico.	4.2% (1977)[c]	63% White, 37% Non-White (1977)[c]

SOURCE: Data in this chart were provided by each site in the Pre-Application proposals submitted for participation in the Entitlement Demonstration. Unemployment rates and Racial Composition figures were not consistently defined in the proposals.

[a]Rates shown are for the City.

[b]Rates shown are for the Prime Sponsor Area.

[c]Rates shown are for the State.

[d]Rates shown are for the Entitlement Area.

TABLE 1 (CONTINUED)

SUMMARY CHARACTERISTICS OF SITES SELECTED FOR
PARTICIPATION IN THE YOUTH ENTITLEMENT DEMONSTRATION

Tier II

Site	DOL Region	Entitlement Area	Unemployment Rate	Racial Composition
Alachua	IV	Two school districts encompassing urban and rural areas	4.5% (1977)[a]	79% White, 21% Non-White (1970)[a]
Albuquerque	VI	One high school attendance district	9.8% (1976)[a]	90% White, 10% Non-White, 54% Hispanic (1970)[c]
Berkeley	IX	Entire City	14.6% (1976)[b]	63% White, 37% Non-White, 7% Hispanic (1978)[b]
Dayton	V	One census tract in the city of Dayton, Ohio	10% (1977)[b]	1% White, 99% Non-White (1977)[c]
Hillsborough	I	Entire City of Nashua	5% (1978)[b]	99% White, 1% Non-White (1978)[b]
Monterey	IX	One school district in a preponderantly rural area	6.7% (1978)[b]	86% White, 14% Non-White, 27% Hispanic (1978)[b]
New York	II	Part of one school district in Brooklyn	12.0% (1975)[c]	40% White, 60% Non-White, 6% Hispanic (1970)[c]
Philadelphia	III	One census tract in North Philadelphia	9.7% (1977)[b]	61% White, 39% Non-White (1978)[b]
Steuben	II	Seven school districts in rural Steuben County, New York	8.1% (1976)[b]	99% White, 1% Non-White (1976)[b]
Syracuse	II	Entire City	8.6% (1977)[b]	85% White, 15% Non-White (1978)[b]

SOURCE: Data in this chart were provided by each site in the Pre-Application proposals submitted for participation in the Entitlement Demonstration. Unemployment rates and Racial Composition figures were not consistently defined in the proposals.

[a]Rates are shown for the standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA).

[b]Rates are shown for the Prime Sponsor Area.

[c]Rates are shown for the Entitlement Area.

period of time for this kind of research/demonstration program. The authorizing statute was approved by President Carter August 5, 1977, and within 11 months -- by June 30, 1978, the end of the period covered by this report -- a total of nearly 30,000 youngsters in 17 locations across the country had been enrolled.

An outline of the key steps in this process, illustrating the tight timetable, is as follows:

8/5/77 -- President Carter signs Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act of 1977;

9/2/77 -- DOL invites competitive applications from over 450 CETA prime sponsors;

10/26/77 -- DOL awards 34 planning grants out of 153 pre-applications received;

12/14/77 -- Final applications received;

1/10/78 -- 17 final grants announced by DOL;

3/20/78 -- First youths assigned to Entitlement worksites.

Role of MDRC

Because of the scope of the research effort and the complexity of implementing a project of this magnitude, the Employment and Training Administration (ETA) engaged the Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation (MDRC) to manage the research and analysis of the Entitlement Demonstration and to coordinate its implementation under the supervision, management, and direction of the Department of Labor's Office of Youth Programs.

MDRC's participation in the Entitlement Demonstration began in the earliest stages of program planning, when Labor Department offi-

cials requested MDRC to assist in the overall development, implementation, and assessment of the project. During the pre-operational period, MDRC assisted in drawing up guidelines for applications by prime sponsors, establishing selection criteria, conducting in-depth site visits to final applicants, and preparing research and information system designs.

As the demonstration became operational, MDRC's work included negotiation of final grant budgets and contracts and extensions or modifications to these, assistance to the sites in setting up systems to meet program information requirements, on-site field monitoring of the phase-in of program enrollees and staff, development of procedures to monitor fiscal systems and spending rates, and continued development and implementation of all aspects of the research design. The research is described in detail in Chapter V of this report.

Following a nationwide competitive, two-step selection process conducted in the fall of 1977, DOL chose 17 CETA prime sponsors -- out of a total of 153 which had applied -- to receive Entitlement grants. Of the 17 grantees, seven received large grants for the creation of between 3,000 and 8,000 jobs each for eligible teenagers. The other 10 grantees have smaller-scale programs to create between 200 and 1,000 jobs each. The seven larger programs, operating in entire cities, portions of large cities, and multi-county regions, are known as "Tier I" projects. The 10 smaller efforts, typically covering less populated areas or very small portions of large cities, are known as "Tier II".

Entitlement funding for Tier I sites ranges from $8.5 million to $23 million; for Tier II the amounts are between $750,000 and $1.25 million.

Details of the site selection process were provided in the March, 1978, Entitlement report, but a few words summarizing the key features are in order here.

Because of the high cost of Entitlement, only a few full saturation tests could be tried which would guarantee jobs to eligible youths in an entire prime sponsor area of substantial size. In order also to develop a number of the secondary experiments and innovations proposed by the legislation, the two-tier approach was designed. So that the demonstrations would in fact constitute a national experiment, sites were chosen to represent a wide economic and geographic range--both large and small cities, high-density urban areas, and sparsely populated rural regions, as well as areas of varying unemployment rates, school drop-out rates, and racial/ethnic composition. Some of these factors are exhibited in Table 1.

Criteria for assessment of prime sponsor applications were:

-- Overall quality and thoroughness of the presentation;

-- Managerial, administrative, operating, and fiscal capability of the prime sponsor and the designated management agency;

-- Level of commitment of other resources to the Entitlement project;

-- The degree to which Entitlement would be integrated with local education, career development, and employment and training programs;

-- Commitment of cooperation and participation from local groups;

-- The prime sponsor's and managing agency's previous experience in administering related programs;

-- Proposed total cost, unit costs, and cost structure;

-- Commitment and ability to provide the data required for the research and analysis.

To maintain the maximum fairness and objectivity in the selection of project sites, a series of standardized formats was designed for analysis of submissions at both the regional and national levels.

An impartial, interdisciplinary Entitlement Selection and Review Panel was established, composed of individuals from academic, labor, community-based organizations, youth population, and manpower/social program backgrounds. The panel was selected by the Department of Labor to assess the Entitlement applications and make recommendations to the Assistant Secretary.

Except for Detroit and Boston, each of the 17 sites was funded for an 18-month period extending from January, 1978 through June 30, 1979. Detroit and Boston, which were originally funded for nine months, were later extended to run for the same total period as the other locations.*

More details on each of the individual sites and the various local participating groups taking part in project administration, are contained in the site profiles in the Appendix. In summary:

-- six sites encompass an entire city, and one of these also includes a large surrounding area;

-- three sites are predominately rural;

---

* To provide a longer time during which there would be greater opportunities for generating significant research results, all sites were recently extended to operate through June 30, 1980, or a total of 30 months including a total of two and one half school years and two summers.

-- eight sites have double-digit unemployment rates, and

-- nine of the 10 federal regions of the country are represented with a site in the demonstration.

II. CHARACTERISTICS OF PARTICIPATING YOUTHS

Eligibility

To be eligible for the program, a youth must:

-- reside in a designated Entitlement area;

-- be between 16 and 19 years old;

-- be a member of a family receiving cash welfare or a family with income at or below the poverty level;

-- be enrolled in high school or a GED program (out-of-school youths must re-enroll or enter a GED program); and

-- maintain satisfactory school and work attendance and performance standards.

These criteria and the methods by which they are enforced are detailed in Table 2. The criteria themselves--the requirement for periodic reverification and for the termination of youths who fail to meet standards of school performance--are unique in manpower programs where benefits are not a matter of entitlement.

The data which follow in this and succeeding sections of the report are from the Information System designed by MDRC for the Entitlement Demonstration. Because of its newness, and the fact that prime sponsors were not accustomed to its procedures and requirements, there were difficulties in getting it smoothly functioning during the period covered by this report. As a result, data in this report are subject to further refinement and correction.

TABLE 2

ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

	PRE-ENROLLMENT AND RE-ENTRY			MAINTAINING ELIGIBILITY			
CRITERION	DEFINITION	DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE	FILE DOCUMENTATION	FREQUENCY	DEFINITION	DOCUMENTED EVIDENCE	FILE DOCUMENTATION
Residency	Residency in Entitlement area - current and for 30 days preceding enrollment (newly discharged veterans excepted)	Receipt Evidence and/or Residency Statement or approved affidavit	* Residency Statement or approved affidavit	Annually	Same as Pre-Enrollment	Same as Pre-enrollment; updated at the time of re-certification	* Residency Statement or approved affidavit
Citizenship	U.S. Citizen or Permanent Resident Alien or Refugee	Visual inspection of passport, birth certificate, voter registration, naturalization paper, Green Card or refugee card	*	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	None	None
Age	16-19 Years of Age (unless exception stated in grant)	Birth certificate, passport, baptismal certificate, driver's license or school verification of age	*	Ongoing	Under 20 years of age or 20 years old and completing minimum Entitlement guarantee	None	If 20 years old, statement indicating end of minimum guarantee
School Enrollment	Enrolled in high school or program leading to high school diploma or GED	School Enrollment Statement or Official School Roster	* and School Enrollment Statement or School Roster	Ongoing	Continued Enrollment	Monthly School Statement	Monthly School Statement
School Attendance and Performance Standards	None	None	None	Monthly	Meeting Minimum Standards	Monthly School Statement	Monthly School Statement
Work Attendance and Performance Standards	None	None	None	Monthly	Meeting Minimum Standards	Local Definition	Local Definition
Economically Disadvantaged	Member of a family receiving cash welfare or a family with income at or below the poverty level	Evidence of welfare receipt and/or Income Statement, Part A or Part B	* Income Statement	Annually	Same as Pre-enrollment	Same as Pre-enrollment; updated at the time of re-certification	* Income Statement
Approved participation by juvenile or criminal justice authorities (where applicable)	Approval granted by appropriate authroity	Written statement of approval	Approval Statement	Ongoing	Approval Continued	Absence of letter rescinding approval	None

*Eligibility Checklist (MDRCYE-01-0178) with verification entry completed by program staff for this criterion.

Profile

There were 29,747 youths who had been enrolled in the demonstration (both Tier I and Tier II) as of June 30. The typical enrollee was 16.8 years old, not employed, and had completed an average of 9.7 grades in school. In the school semester prior to their enrollment, 92 percent were in high school and two percent were in a GED program; six percent had been out of school.

Of the 29,747 total enrolled:

-- 76 percent were Black (non-Hispanic);

-- 52 percent were female;

-- 36 percent had previously participated in another CETA employment program;

-- six percent were parents, with an average of 1.5 children each.

Table 3 has more details on these characteristics.

There are important differences between youths who were in school the semester prior to enrollment and those who were out of school. Out-of-school youths were older, more often male, and had completed fewer years of school. After enrollment in Entitlement, nearly two-thirds of the out-of-school youths began participation in GED programs compared to in-school youths where less than four percent were GED participants at the beginning of their Entitlement experience.

Site Differences

Cash Welfare. Overall, 47 percent of the enrollees were receiving cash welfare. In four of the 17 sites the percentage was 50 percent or

TABLE 3

CHARACTERISTICS AT TIME OF ENROLLMENT
OF YOUTH ENROLLED IN YOUTH ENTITLEMENT DEMONSTRATION
THROUGH JUNE 1978, BY TIER

Characteristic	Percent of Total or Average		
	Tier I	Tier II	Total Demonstration
Age			
16 years	46	47	46
17 years	33	33	33
18 years	16	16	16
19 years	5	4	5
Average Age (years)	16.8	16.7	16.8
Sex			
Male	48	47	48
Female	52	53	52
Ethnicity			
White (Non-Hispanic)	15	17	15
Black (Non-Hispanic)	77	63	76
Amer. Indian/Alaskan Native	0	0	0
Asian/Pacific Islander	2	1	1
Hispanic	6	19	8
Marital Status			
Never Married	99	99	99
Married	1	1	1
Head of Household	1	2	1
Living With Own Children	6	6	6
Average Number of Own Children	1.6	1.3	1.5
Family Receiving Cash Welfare (AFDC, SSI, GA)	48	42	47

Characteristic	Percent of Total or Average		
	Tier I	Tier II	Total Demonstration
Ever Participate in a CETA Employment Program	36	38	36
Labor Force Status			
Employed	4	4	4
Not Employed	96	96	96
Average Weeks Worked in Last Year	11.4	12.6	11.5
Average Earnings in Last Year ($)	704	735	708
Most Recent Job			
Average Hours Worked/Week	23.4	23.6	23.4
Average Hourly Wage ($)	2.47	2.44	2.47
Highest Grade Completed			
0-7	2	1	2
8	9	6	8
9	29	30	29
10	34	37	35
11	26	26	26
Average Highest Grade Completed	9.7	9.8	9.7
Out of School in the Semester Prior to Enrollment in Entitlement	6	3	6
Ever Dropped Out of School For A Semester	12	10	12
Total Youth Enrolled	26,790	2,957	29,747

SOURCE: Tabulations of Enrollment Forms in the Youth Entitlement Information System.

NOTES Percentage distributions and averages were based on the number of responses to each question. Data were available for at least 99.5 percent of all youth enrolled in the program for all questions.

"Average Number of Own Children" is based on only enrollees who indicated they had children. "Average Weeks Worked in Last Year", "Average Earnings in Last Year", and both the "Average Hours Worked Per Week" and the "Average Hourly Wage" for the most recent job are based on only enrollees who had ever worked in an unsubsidized job.

*Less than .1%.

or greater: King-Snohomish (56 percent), Baltimore (52 percent), Cincinnati (50 percent) and Syracuse (50 percent).

In eight of the sites, the percentage receiving cash welfare was 30 percent or less: Steuben County (four percent), Alachua County (16 percent), Mississippi (23 percent), New York City (25 percent), Hillsborough County (26 percent), Philadelphia (28 percent), Miami Valley (29 percent), and Denver (30 percent).

Ethnic Background. Overall, 76 percent of the enrollees were Black. Eight percent were Hispanic; these youths were predominantly located in three Western sites: Monterey County with an 89 percent Hispanic enrollment; Albuquerque with 78 percent, and Denver with 44 percent.

There were seven sites with Black enrollment of 90 percent or greater: Philadelphia and Miami Valley (100 percent); Baltimore (98 percent); Alachua County and New York City (93 percent); Detroit (92 percent); and Cincinnati (91 percent).

Three sites had majority White (non-Hispanic) enrollments: Steuben County (98 percent); Hillsborough County (95 percent); and King-Snohomish (53 percent).

School Drop-Outs. Overall, six percent of the enrollees were not in school in the semester prior to enrollment and 12 percent had, at some time, dropped out of school for at least an entire semester. Three sites had particularly high numbers of youths with a drop-out history: Steuben County (34 percent); Hillsborough (21 percent); and Denver (20

percent). See Table 4 for characteristics of in-school and out-of-school youths.

More details on other characteristics of enrollees by site are contained in Tables 5 (Tier I) and 6 (Tier II).

TABLE 4

SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF ENROLLEES
IN THE YOUTH ENTITLEMENT DEMONSTRATION THROUGH JUNE 1978
BY TIER AND EDUCATIONAL STATUS IN THE SEMESTER PRIOR TO ENROLLMENT

Characteristic	Percent of Total					
	Tier I		Tier II		Total Demonstration	
	In School	Out of School	In School	Out of School	In School	Out of School
Age						
16 years	48.2	19.6	47.8	29.8	48.1	20.1
17 years	32.8	28.4	32.8	24.5	32.8	28.2
18 years	14.9	32.2	15.5	30.8	15.0	32.2
19 years	4.1	19.7	3.9	14.9	4.1	19.5
Sex						
Male	48.1	51.6	47.3	45.7	48.1	51.3
Female	51.9	48.4	52.7	54.3	51.9	48.7
Ethnicity						
White (Non-Hispanic)	14.6	12.3	16.3	44.7	14.8	14.0
Black (Non-Hispanic)	77.1	74.8	64.1	20.2	75.8	72.0
American Indian/ Alaskan Native	0.5	0.9	0.4	2.1	0.4	1.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	1.7	0.3	1.0	1.1	1.6	0.3
Hispanic	6.1	11.7	18.2	31.9	7.4	12.7
Highest Grade Completed						
0-7	1.3	10.2	0.6	4.3	1.3	9.9
8	8.3	17.6	5.9	11.7	8.0	17.3
9	28.5	30.9	29.3	36.2	28.5	31.2
10	35.0	27.8	37.6	28.7	35.3	27.8
11	26.9	13.5	26.6	19.1	26.9	13.8
Current Educational Status						
In High School	96.4	36.8	95.0	46.3	96.3	37.2
In GED	3.6	63.2	5.0	53.7	3.7	62.7
Number of Enrollees	24,924	1,696	2,855	94	27,779	1,790

SOURCE: Tabulations of Enrollment Forms in the Youth Entitlement Information System.

NOTE: Percentage distribution were based on the number of responses to each question. Data were available for at least 99.0 percent of all youth enrolled in the program for all questions.

TABLE 5

SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF YOUTH ENROLLED IN THE YOUTH ENTITLEMENT DEMONSTRATION THROUGH JUNE 1978, BY SITE

TIER I

Characteristic	Percent of Total or Average									
	Baltimore	Boston	Cincinnati	Denver	Detroit	King-Snohomish	Mississippi	Total Tier I	Total Tier II	Total Demonstration
Age										
16 years	42	49	44	51	47	46	50	46	47	46
17 years	32	33	34	29	32	34	33	33	33	33
18 years	19	14	17	15	16	16	14	16	16	16
19 years	7	4	5	5	5	4	3	5	4	5
Average Age (years)	16.9	16.7	16.8	16.7	16.8	16.8	16.7	16.8	16.7	16.8
Sex										
Male	48	52	47	48	47	46	49	48	47	48
Female	52	48	53	52	53	54	51	52	53	52
Ethnicity										
White (Non-Hispanic)	2	35	9	12	3	53	16	15	17	15
Black (Non-Hispanic)	98	53	91	40	92	29	84	77	63	76
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0	0	0	1	0	4	0	0	0	0
Asian/Pacific Islander	0	4	0	3	0	11	0	2	1	1
Hispanic	0	8	0	44	5	3	0	6	19	8
Family Receiving Cash Welfare (AFDC, SSI, GA)	59	49	51	39	51	44	30	48	42	47
Highest Grade Completed										
0-7	5	1	1	1	0	1	1	2	1	2
8	13	11	7	5	8	4	5	9	6	8
9	33	34	32	34	26	25	16	29	30	29
10	31	32	39	37	36	38	36	34	37	35
11	18	22	21	23	30	32	42	26	26	26
Average Highest Grade Completed	9.4	9.6	9.7	9.7	9.9	10.0	10.1	9.7	9.8	9.7
Out of School in the Semester Prior to Enrollment in Entitlement	11	3	7	10	3	4	2	6	3	6
Ever Dropped Out of School for a Semester	18	9	13	20	9	10	4	12	10	12
Ever Participated in a CETA Employment Program	46	12	42	36	46	71	13	36	38	36
Labor Force Status										
Employed	4	7	1	6	2	0	2	4	4	4
Not Employed	96	93	99	94	98	100	98	96	96	96
Total Youth Enrolled	7,594	4,288	2,241	2,589	3,975	1,783	4,320	26,790	2,957	29,747

SOURCE AND NOTES: Refer to Table 3.

TABLE 6

SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF YOUTH ENROLLED IN THE YOUTH ENTITLEMENT DEMONSTRATION THROUGH JUNE 1978, BY SITE

TIER II

Characteristic	Percent of Total or Average										
	Alachua County	Albuquerque	Berkeley	Dayton	Hillsborough	Monterey	New York	Philadelphia	Steuben County	Syracuse	Total Tier II
Age											
16 years	47	52	51	41	54	50	42	45	46	44	47
17 years	37	36	31	35	32	26	31	41	24	32	33
18 years	15	10	15	17	12	20	19	13	20	18	16
19 years	1	2	3	7	2	4	8	1	10	6	4
Average Age (years)	16.7	16.6	16.7	16.8	16.6	16.8	16.9	16.7	16.9	16.8	16.7
Sex											
Male	47	48	52	50	42	47	39	37	63	51	47
Female	53	52	48	50	58	53	61	63	37	49	53
Ethnicity											
White (Non-Hispanic)	7	3	9	0	95	7	5	0	98	26	17
Black (Non-Hispanic)	93	17	80	100	3	1	93	100	0	71	63
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0	2	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0
Asian/Pacific Islander	0	0	4	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1
Hispanic	0	78	7	0	1	89	2	0	2	2	19
Family Receiving Cash Welfare (AFDC, SSI, GA)	30	42	49	35	26	44	30	43	20	50	42
Highest Grade Completed											
0-7	1	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	1	1	1
8	2	2	3	9	15	11	8	2	18	8	6
9	24	24	32	30	36	35	28	29	28	31	30
10	37	45	38	37	36	35	41	32	31	34	37
11	36	29	27	24	9	19	23	37	22	26	26
Average Highest Grade Completed	10.1	10.0	9.9	9.8	9.3	9.6	9.8	10.0	9.6	9.7	9.8
Out of School in the Semester Prior to Enrollment in Entitlement	0	4	2	4	11	8	*	0	18	2	3
Ever Dropped Out of School for a Semester	5	18	6	11	21	15	2	1	34	12	10
Ever Participated in a CETA Employment Program	38	33	56	46	44	38	31	7	20	41	38
Labor Force Status											
Employed	1	7	0	0	14	7	1	5	3	3	4
Not Employed	99	93	100	100	86	93	99	95	97	97	96
Total Youth Enrolled	192	436	510	46	100	169	399	205	95	805	2957

SOURCE AND NOTES: Refer to Table 3.

III. PROGRAM START-UP, RECRUITMENT, AND ENROLLMENT

Program Initiation

Because of the short time available for planning, the complex research requirements, and the need to involve a variety of community agencies, the Entitlement Demonstration is in many respects much more complicated to operate than are the other CETA programs. Entitlement's school-conditioned job guarantee, for instance, requires coordination among the prime sponsor, the schools, and the numerous public and private participating employers. This in itself is a complicated undertaking especially since two of the parties, schools and worksites, are not unitary agents but consist of diverse institutions, agencies, and businesses. And it was evident from the start that other groups, organizations, and institutions would be involved in carrying out Entitlement's objectives as well, particularly if the program was to be implemented quickly. Congress itself recognized this when it directed the Department of Labor to obtain:

> Assurances that the prime sponsor has consulted with public and private nonprofit educational agencies including vocational and postsecondary education institutions and other agencies which offer high school equivalency programs, public employers, including law enforcement and judicial agencies, labor organizations, voluntary youth groups, community-based organizations, organi-

> zations of demonstrated effectiveness with a special knowledge of the needs of such disadvantaged youth, and with the private sector in the development of the plan, and assurances that arrangements are made with appropriate groups to assist the prime sponsor in carrying out the purposes of this subpart. Section 327 (a) (4) (I)

Existing community-based agencies would serve as outreach and intake agencies for eligible youths, especially those out of school; business associations were appropriate agents to help obtain private sector worksites; criminal justice agencies could refer eligible youths to the program; and other agencies experienced with youths such as public assistance agencies, would help carry out such basic Entitlement program activities as recruitment and enrollment, job development, worksite monitoring and schooling. All these groups and their activities had to be orchestrated.

Prime sponsors to varying degrees utilized agencies with whom they had established a prior service delivery relationship. In addition, the size of the Tier I program, a variety of innovative program features such as the encouragement of broad private sector involvement, and the novelty of the Entitlement concept itself, meant that new agencies, unfamiliar to CETA, also had to be involved. Moreover, experienced local agencies involved in regular CETA programs needed to be oriented to meet the new requirements of Entitlement.

Recruitment

Most of the discussion here deals with recruitment efforts at the large, Tier I sites which enrolled between 1,700-7,500 youths each by June 30. The major differences between their efforts and those in

Tier II sites, which enrolled between 46 and 800 each, was the scope of the activity. In many Tier II sites, for example, participation was limited to a confined area such as one high school district. Here, recruitment could in some cases be directed at individual needy youths on a one-to-one basis. In contrast, in the larger Tier I sites, more elaborate programs were required to reach and inform all those who were eligible.

In the first few months of the program covered by this report, most recruitment and, consequently, most enrollment was of youths already in school. This is understandable since these youths are more readily identified and located, and represent a more convenient target for early activity. It is still an open question as to how many out-of-school youths can be reached and re-enrolled in school (or GED) to become eligible for Entitlement.

For the most part, the Tier I sites used similar procedures to make the project known, similar outreach structures for recruitment, and similar basic processes for enrollment. Within the sites, however, there were differences between efforts directed at the in-school and out-of-school populations. These two groups, due to largely differing needs and characteristics, were treated as separate cases by most Tier I prime sponsors, and the various structures and strategies for recruitment and enrollment reflect this difference.

Tier I prime sponsors, in order to inform and attract eligibles, decided early on to conduct media campaigns. Such campaigns, it was thought, had the best potential to reach eligibles, especially those

out of school, and a well-presented campaign could be used to carefully explain the program.

Among the elements generally included in the campaigns were distribution of Entitlement posters and flyers, establishment of 24-hour-a-day "hot lines" for information and advice, airing of public service announcements, distribution of press releases and paid advertisements, kick-off press conferences, and participation of Entitlement staff in local television talk and youth-oriented shows. Not all prime sponsors utilized all these techniques in the same proportions, and there was also a variety in the overall size of the effort.

While general media campaigns were directed principally at out-of-school eligibles, a similarly concerted effort was made in the area of in-school recruitment. Here, it was felt, the program had the best chance of attracting enrollees through the twin channels of school media systems and guidance office contacts.

In-school recruitment and enrollment were organized largely as a cooperative venture among the schools, the prime sponsor and the employment service. While the responsibilities of these agencies sometimes overlapped and the roles they played in the process varied somewhat from site to site, in general, the schools were responsible for initial publicizing of the program and shared with the prime sponsor or the employment service, responsibility for advising interested youths about the program. Announcements were made through the school public address systems and notices were affixed in prominent places throughout the school. In some schools, counselors supplemented the media campaign by

initiating contact with students whom they believed would be eligible for and benefit from Entitlement.

In contrast, the out-of-school group presented large obstacles for recruitment and enrollment. The lack of a central gathering place with easy means of communication, equivalent to a school, was a major disadvantage, one that could only be partially overcome by the media campaigns most prime sponsors conducted.

Local community-based organizations were utilized in the out-of-school recruitment and enrollment. In the Tier I sites, these organizations included neighborhood action groups, private youth services agencies, and local recreational and community centers. Through their contacts and position in the community, these groups could provide a framework for informing eligible youths and attracting them to the Entitlement program. Many also functioned as initial intake and processing centers.

Other methods utilized in out-of-school outreach efforts included, in Boston, establishing Entitlement information centers at "Little City Halls", neighborhood satellites of the mayor's office and, in Syracuse, attempting to directly contact out-of-school youths through the mails. In Baltimore, both in-school and out-of-school youths were recruited through a unique method using worksites involved in the Summer Program for Economically Disadvantaged Youths (SPEDY) to identify and refer interested eligibles. In Cincinnati, youths involved with the criminal justice system were referred to the program through the Cincinnati Institute of Justice, an organization concerned with juvenile delinquents

and reform of the criminal justice system.

Recruitment Results by Source

By far the most significant source of recruitment for all enrollees through June 30 was the school, which accounted for two-thirds of the total. The school accounted for only 19 percent of the out-of-school youths, however. For out-of-school youths, the most important recruitment source was friends, who referred over one-third of this group. Complete data for both tiers and the demonstration overall are in Table 7.

Enrollment and Assignment Rates

Overall, actual enrollments fell short of the estimates made by the prime sponsors in preparing their applications. The estimates of total enrollments amounted to nearly 44,000 youths, compared with the nearly 30,000 who had enrolled by June 30, 1978.

The main reason for the gap between estimates and actual enrollments appears to have been overly-ambitious estimates, made by prime sponsors perhaps with an eye towards being fully funded to meet their job guarantee commitments. Other factors included availability in the locality of other CETA employment alternatives for eligible youths, difficulties of re-enrolling returning drop-outs in mid-school term, coordination of program agents, and operational problems deriving in part from unusually stringent eligibility and research requirements.

Enrollments and job assignments increased markedly in June, the third full month of program operations. Enrollments increased by 75 percent from nearly 17,000 at the end of May, to nearly 30,000 at the end of June, and job assignments increased by 125 percent from 9,500

TABLE 7

RECRUITMENT SOURCE OF ENROLLEES
IN THE YOUTH ENTITLEMENT DEMONSTRATION
THROUGH JUNE 1978, BY TIER AND EDUCATIONAL STATUS IN THE SEMESTER PRIOR TO ENROLLMENT

Site and Prior Educational Status	Number of Enrollees	Percent Distribution of Enrollees by Recruitment Source						
		Friends	School	Newspaper, Radio, TV	Community Org.	Employment Service	Other	Total
TIER I								
In School	24,924	9.5	69.4	2.0	9.5	2.4	7.2	100.0
Out of School	1,696	36.0	17.2	4.0	14.1	2.5	26.2	100.0
Total	26,620	11.2	66.1	2.1	9.8	2.4	8.4	100.0
TIER II								
In School	2,855	11.3	74.4	1.2	6.3	0.5	6.3	100.0
Out of School	94	18.5	46.7	5.4	9.8	1.1	18.5	100.0
Total	2,949	11.6	73.5	1.4	6.4	0.5	6.6	100.0
TOTAL DEMONSTRATION								
In School	27,779	9.7	69.9	1.9	9.2	2.2	7.1	100.0
Out of School	1,790	35.1	18.7	4.1	13.9	2.4	25.8	100.0
Total	29,569	11.2	66.9	2.0	9.4	2.2	8.3	100.0

SOURCE: Tabulations of Enrollment Forms in the Youth Entitlement Information System.

NOTE: Percentage distribution may not add exactly to 100.0 because of rounding.

to 21,500 in the same period. The percentage of enrolled youths assigned to a job or training nearly tripled between March and June, rising from 26 percent to 72 percent. Early start-up delays in making these assignments began to diminish as program operations became more smooth.

Tables 8 and 9 detail and illustrate enrollment and assignment data.

Conclusions

Early attention was paid to gearing up and attracting in-school youths while recruitment of out-of-school youths came in later program stages. It remains to be seen how many drop-outs will resume schooling (or GED) to avail themselves of the Entitlement guarantee.

TABLE 8

YOUTH ENROLLED AND ASSIGNED TO JOB OR TRAINING
IN THE YOUTH ENTITLEMENT DEMONSTRATION
THROUGH JUNE 1978, BY SITE

Site	Total Youth Enrolled Through June	Percent of Total Demonstration Enrollment[a]	Youth Assigned to Job or Training Through June	Percent Assigned of Enrolled Youth
TIER I				
Baltimore	7,594	25.5	5,792	76.3
Boston	4,288	14.4	1,783[b]	41.6
Cincinnati	2,241	7.5	1,186	52.9
Denver	2,589	8.7	1,842	71.1
Detroit	3,975	13.4	2,779	69.9
King-Snohomish	1,783	6.0	1,582	88.7
Mississippi	4,320	14.5	4,146	96.0
TOTAL TIER I	26,790	90.0	19,110	71.3
TIER II				
Alachua County	192	0.6	186	96.9
Albuquerque	436	1.5	430	98.6
Berkeley	510	1.7	327	64.1
Dayton	46	0.2	45	97.8
Hillsborough	100	0.3	75	75.0
Monterey	169	0.6	130	76.9
New York	399	1.3	257	64.4
Philadelphia	205	0.7	201	98.0
Steuben County	95	0.3	75	78.9
Syracuse	805	2.7	753	93.5
TOTAL TIER II	2,957	9.9	2,479	83.8
TOTAL DEMONSTRATION	29,747	100.0	21,589	72.6

SOURCE: Youth Entitlement Grant Agreement and Tabulations of Enrollment and Status Change Forms in the Youth Entitlement Information System.

NOTES: Enrolled youth are those youth who have completed intake and eligibility verification and are available for assignment to work or training.

[a]Percentages may not add exactly to 100.0 because of rounding.

[b]The Boston program reports a higher number of youth assigned. However, forms were not received in the Entitlement Information System as of this report.

TABLE 9

YOUTH ENROLLED AND ASSIGNED TO JOB OR TRAINING
IN THE YOUTH ENTITLEMENT DEMONSTRATION
THROUGH JUNE 1978, BY MONTH AND TIER

Item	1978 Cumulative				
	February	March	April	May	June
TIER I					
Number of Youth:					
Enrolled	3,781	9,804	12,960	15,003	26,790
Assigned	0	2,254	5,909	7,834	19,110
% Assigned of Enrolled Youth	0	23.0	45.6	52.2	71.3
TIER II					
Number of Youth:					
Enrolled	296	957	1,679	1,975	2,958
Assigned	0	592	1,229	1,710	2,479
% Assigned of Enrolled Youth	0	61.9	73.2	86.6	83.8
TOTAL DEMONSTRATION					
Number of Youth:					
Enrolled	4,077	10,761	14,639	16,978	29,747
Assigned	0	2,846	7,138	9,544	21,589
% Assigned of Enrolled Youth	0	26.4	48.8	56.2	72.6

SOURCE: Youth Entitlement Grant Agreement and Tabulations of Enrollment and Status Change Forms in the Youth Entitlement Information System.

NOTES: Enrolled youth are those youth who have completed intake and eligibility verification and are available for assignment to work or training.

IV. JOB CREATION AND WORKSITES

Soliciting Public Sector and Nonprofit Worksites

Since the prime sponsors had to develop commitments of worksites in order to complete final applications during November, 1977, nearly all resorted to their established networks of public and nonprofit youth work sponsors, chiefly their lists of worksites from previous Title III summer programs (the Summer Program for Economically Disadvantaged Youth, SPEDY). Prime sponsors often approached these agencies by describing Entitlement in operational shorthand as "SPEDY with an in-school component".

While most prime sponsors approached individual work sponsors directly, some worked through established intermediary agencies. In Cincinnati, for instance, the human resources unit of the city public schools had managed the public sector aspect of the summer program on subcontract, handling intake, certification, and job creation, and was assigned the same basic role for Entitlement. In Mississippi, the Employment Service played its customary role in job creation for the 19-county Entitlement area for worksites in the public and nonprofit sectors.

Soliciting Private Sector Worksites

The novel provision of the Entitlement legislation encouraging work opportunities in the private, for-profit sector, and the authorization for prime sponsors to subsidize up to the full cost of wages and fringe benefits for youths at such worksites, presented prime sponsors with an opportunity which most welcomed. Development of private sector commit-

ments, however, posed a much greater challenge than locating public and nonprofit agency job sites.

Since the enactment of CETA, prime sponsors have expended relatively few program resources in developing work and training positions with the private sector. This was, the prime sponsors feel, in part the result of the recession of 1974-75, and in part the result of a longer-term lack of contact and some degree of mutual misunderstanding between business firms and public manpower deliverers. Several prime sponsors indicated that Entitlement would offer them the opportunity to establish links with the private sector for youth programs, and to gain good will which might lead to expanded joint efforts in future programs.

With a desire to develop private sector work and to encourage firms to participate, particularly under the time constraints of the planning period, all the prime sponsors that decided to develop private sector sites*, except Mississippi, offered the full 100 percent subsidy as an inducement to local businesses. Mississippi offered a 75 percent subsidy. The Dayton project also had a very small experimental component which provided 50 percent payment for on-the-job training. The main reason for utilizing the full subsidy authorized in the statute was the belief that few firms would initially come forward at lower subsidies because of their concerns about low productivity and poor work habits of unskilled youths.

Prime sponsors did not have readily-available networks of contact with local firms. To identify and approach businesses, sponsors chose

* All except Albuquerque and Steuben County decided to have private sector worksites.

to work through intermediary agencies such as Chambers of Commerce and the National Alliance of Businessmen (NAB).

Union Involvement

The legislation refers to two possible roles for organized labor: first as potential sponsors for youth in apprenticeship positions, and second as a party to any negotiations over wage rates which would otherwise require payment of prevailing wages under CETA and the Davis-Bacon Act.

Prime sponsors took little initiative in seeking to develop apprenticeship arrangements for Entitlement youths. This appeared to reflect for the most part prime sponsor caution in using Entitlement to venture into apprenticeship arrangements, where sponsors had little prior experience. The time required to fashion these arrangements was also a deterrent in some cases.

Involvement of unions in other aspects was more considerable. Care was taken to establish informal liaison with union locals before program start-up, to encourage their cooperation, and to anticipate any possible objections that unions might have with respect to Entitlement participants displacing union workers.

Boston and Cincinnati established a more formal liaison with public employee unions. The Boston prime sponsor agreed that no youths would be placed in city department jobs "without prior submission of the occupation and job description to AFSCME Council 93." In Cincinnati, the AFSCME local has a subcontract from the prime sponsor to structure public sector assignments to ensure that these do not conflict with established public jobs. Philadelphia's program has several unions involved in moni-

toring worksites and in overall project assistance.

Worksites

As of June 30, about two-thirds of the assigned youths were working in public agencies, with about one-third of this number working in public schools. Another one-quarter were working in nonprofit organizations, and 10 percent were in the private, for-profit sector. This distribution reflects the usual pattern of youth work assignments in predecessor and related CETA youth programs such as SPEDY. In only seven sites were private, for-profit work assignments as much as 20 percent or more of the total, and five of these seven are Tier II sites. Philadelphia, with 70 percent and Monterey County with 62.5 percent were the only two places with a majority of private, for-profit worksites.

Through June 30, over three-quarters of all paid hours were in clerical, sales, services, and aide positions such as recreation leader and program aide. Virtually all the jobs were paid at the $2.65 per hour federal minimum wage.

Details on types of work are in Tables 10, 11, and 12.

Jobs and Work Sponsors in the Public Sector

The nature of the jobs created for participants in public sector settings varied across the programs. The Entitlement legislation specifically encourages the development of jobs in areas such as environmental quality, health care, social services, neighborhood improvement, conservation, and community improvement.

In Cincinnati, for example, participants designed, constructed, and painted street furniture to be placed in the downtown area. In Missis-

TABLE 10

ANALYSIS OF JOB ACTIVITY
IN THE YOUTH ENTITLEMENT DEMONSTRATION
THROUGH JUNE 1978, BY OCCUPATION

Occupational Category[a]	Total Job Hours	Percent of all Job Hours	Most Frequently Used Job Titles
Professional, Technical, Managerial[b]	469,640	19.8	Program Aide, Recreation Leader
Clerical, Sales	684,700	28.9	General Clerk, Teacher Aide
Service	698,472	29.5	Janitor, Porter, Day Care Worker
Agriculture, Fishery, Forestry	160,624	6.8	Groundskeeper
Processing[c]	209	*[e]	
Machine Trades	20,693	.9	Auto Mechanic
Benchwork[d]	20,302	.9	
Structural Work	219,534	9.3	Building Repairer
Miscellaneous[c]	91,954	3.9	Material Handler, Warehouse Worker, Street Cleanup Worker
Total	2,366,188	100.0	

SOURCE: Tabulations of Monthly Performance Report data in the Youth Entitlement Demonstration Information System.

NOTES: The data cover all recorded job activity in the 17 sites of the Youth Entitlement Demonstration during the period from March through June, 1978, with the exception of Detroit, where the data cover only through May, 1978.

[a]Occupational categories are based on the one-digit groupings of the Dictionary of Occupational Titles, Fourth Edition, published by the U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, in 1977.

[b]Codes in the D.O.T. under this category have been used in Entitlement because they best describe the work performed, even though the youth are not performing the tasks as a professional, and have not received the educational preparation normally required for the occupation.

[c]The "Processing" category includes occupations concerned with treating materials to prepare them for use as basic materials, or stock for futher manufacturing, or for sale as finished products to commercial users.

[d]The "Benchwork" category includes occupations concerned with using handtools, and bench machines to fabricate, inspect, or repair relatively small products.

[e]Includes a wide range of occupations not classified in other DOT categories (motor freight, transportation, packaging and material handling, mineral extraction, production and distribution of utilities, recreation/motion picture/radio/television occupations, graphic art work).

[f]Less than .1 percent.

TABLE 11

DISTRIBUTION OF YOUTH WORKING
IN THE YOUTH ENTITLEMENT DEMONSTRATION
AT THE END OF JUNE 1978, BY OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORY AND SPONSOR TYPE

Occupational Category	Total Youth Working	Type of Work Sponsor					
		Private Educational Institution	Public Educational Institution	Other Public Agency	Private, For-Profit	Non-Profit Organization	All Types
Total Youth Working	18,030	151	4,432	7,147	1,812	4,488	18,030
Percentage Distribution of Youth Working by Occupational Category[a]							
Professional, Technical, Managerial[b]	3,235	5.3	7.3	25.9	3.5	22.3	17.9
Clerical, Sales	5,176	29.1	35.3	25.2	44.2	20.7	28.7
Services	5,770	28.5	35.8	27.3	27.8	37.5	32.0
Agriculture, Fishery, Forestry	1,237	8.6	4.3	9.2	.9	8.0	6.9
Processing[c]	3	.0	.0	.0	.2	.0	*[f]
Machine Trades	143	2.6	.7	.4	3.6	.2	.8
Benchwork[d]	173	.0	.5	.2	5.5	.9	1.0
Structural Work	1,606	25.1	14.3	8.6	5.4	4.9	8.9
Miscellaneous[e]	687	.7	.9	3.3	8.9	5.6	3.8
Total	18,030	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

SOURCE: Tabulations of Monthly Performance Report data in the Youth Entitlement Demonstration Information System.

NOTES: The data cover all recorded job activity in the 17 sites of the Youth Entitlement Demonstration at the end of June 1978, with the exception of Detroit, where the data relate to the end of May 1978.

Percentage distributions may not add exactly to 100.0 because of rounding.

[a]Occupational categories are based on the one-digit groupings of the Dictionary of Occupational Titles, Fourth Edition, published by the U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, in 1977.

[b]Codes in the D.O.T. under this category have been used in Entitlement because they best describe the work performed, even though the youth are not performing the tasks as a professional, and have not received the educational preparation normally required for the occupations.

[c]The "Processing" category includes occupations concerned with treating materials to prepare them for use as basic materials, or stock for further manufacturing, or for sale as finished products to commercial users.

[d]The "Benchwork" category includes occupations concerned with using handtools, and bench machines to fabricate, inspect, or repair relatively small products.

[e]Includes a wide range of occupations not classified in other DOT categories (motor freight, transportation, packaging and material handling, mineral extraction, production and distribution of utilities, recreation/motion picture/radio/television occupations, graphic art work).

[f]Less than .1 percent.

TABLE 12

DISTRIBUTION OF YOUTH WORKING
IN THE YOUTH ENTITLEMENT DEMONSTRATION
AT THE END OF JUNE 1978, BY OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORY AND SITE

Site	Total Youth Working	Percentage Distribution of Youth Working, by Occupational Category[a]									
		Prof., Technical, Managerial[b]	Clerical, Sales	Service	Agric., Fishery, Forestry	Processing[c]	Machine Trades	Benchwork[d]	Structural Work	Misc.[e]	Total
TIER I											
Baltimore	6,236	28.6	25.4	29.7	6.7	*[f]	.4	.9	1.8	6.4	100.0
Boston	1,886	16.7	36.6	35.8	5.4	.0	.7	.5	2.7	1.6	100.0
Cincinnati	839	20.0	20.4	39.8	13.9	.0	.4	1.1	3.8	.6	100.0
Denver	1,546	32.0	29.6	17.0	4.5	.1	2.1	2.7	7.2	4.7	100.0
Detroit	831	3.0	51.0	43.3	.0	.0	.3	.6	.4	1.4	100.0
King-Snohomish	1,346	15.6	37.8	28.5	6.7	.0	.8	.2	7.8	2.6	100.0
Mississippi	3,741	1.4	19.4	35.9	10.9	.0	.8	.4	30.6	.6	100.0
TOTAL TIER I	16,425	18.6	27.8	31.7	7.3	*[f]	.7	.9	9.5	3.5	100.0
TIER II											
Alachua County	143	14.0	27.3	48.2	2.1	.0	.0	1.4	3.5	3.5	100.0
Albuquerque	429	4.7	40.8	39.9	2.3	.0	1.1	.0	4.2	7.0	100.0
Berkeley	250	12.8	39.2	42.4	.8	.0	1.6	.4	.8	2.0	100.0
Dayton	43	.0	11.6	88.4	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	100.0
Hillsborough	59	18.6	42.4	16.9	1.4	1.7	1.7	5.1	5.1	5.1	100.0
Monterey	88	5.7	50.0	20.5	.0	.0	3.4	4.5	4.5	11.4	100.0
New York	5[g]	20.0	80.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	100.0
Philadelphia	161	3.7	42.3	18.6	.6	.0	.0	11.8	.6	22.4	100.0
Steuben County	10[g]	20.0	.0	.0	80.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	100.0
Syracuse	417	21.6	36.7	27.8	2.4	.0	2.2	.9	4.1	4.3	100.0
TOTAL TIER II	1,605	11.6	38.1	34.8	2.2	.1	1.4	2.0	3.1	6.7	100.0
TOTAL DEMONSTRATION	18,030	17.9	28.7	32.0	6.9	*[f]	.8	1.0	8.9	3.8	100.0

SOURCE: Tabulations of Monthly Performance Report data in the Youth Entitlement Demonstration Information System.

NOTES: The data cover all recorded job activity in the 17 Sites of the Youth Entitlement Demonstration at the end of June 1978, with the exception of Detroit, where the data relate to the end of May 1978.

Percentage distributions may not add exactly to 100.0 because of rounding.

[a]Occupational categories are based on the one-digit groupings of the Dictionary of Occupational Titles, Fourth Edition, published by the U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, in 1977.

[b]Codes in the D.O.T. under this category have been used in Entitlement because they best describe the work performed, even though the youth are not performing the tasks as a professional, and have not received the educational preparation normally required for the occupations.

[c]The "Processing" category includes occupations concerned with treating materials to prepare them for use as basic materials, or stock for further manufacturing, or for sale as finished products to commercial users.

[d]The "Benchwork" category includes occupations concerned with using handtools, and bench machines to fabricate, inspect, or repair relatively small products.

[e]Includes a wide range of occupations not classified in other DOT categories (motor freight, transportation, packaging and material handling, mineral extraction, production and distribution of utilities, recreation/motion picture/radio/television occupations, graphic art work).

[f]Less than .1 percent.

[g]In order to effect the transition from part-time to full-time employment, New York and Steuben County had a break at the end of June. This accounts for the extremely low number of youth working at that time.

sippi, several youths participated in a project to winterize the homes of the elderly. In Albuquerque and Berkeley, federal military installations have established worksites for enrollees. Denver established a project in which Vietnamese youths helped newly arrived Vietnamese to acclimate themselves to their new cultural setting. A Boston effort was called "Hub Scrub", in which some 200 youths participated in an outdoor cleaning and painting program. A comparable project in Baltimore, called "Trash Bash", involved cleaning up and removing debris around the city.

Jobs and Work Sponsors in the Private Sector

At the end of June, there were over 1,800 youths working for private firms in the demonstration, representing 10 percent of all youths working. Nearly 80 percent of these were in four sites. The largest number 472, were in Denver, reflecting its private sector emphasis, followed by Baltimore with 463. Boston and Detroit had 287 and 219 youths, respectively, in private worksites.

The primary industries (using the Standard Industrial Classification, SIC) were wholesale and retail firms (35.2 percent) and service businesses (27.5 percent), which together accounted for over half of all youths working in the private sector. Baltimore had a particularly large proportion (48 percent)of youths working in small retail, and to a much lesser extent, wholesale firms. Denver's private sector emphasis led to the development of almost one-fourth of its private sector positions in manufacturing firms. Service industries were the principal employers for over half of Detroit's 219 youth working in the private sector.

TABLE 13

DISTRIBUTION OF YOUTH WORKING IN THE FOR-PROFIT SECTOR
IN THE YOUTH ENTITLEMENT DEMONSTRATION
AT THE END OF JUNE 1978, BY SPONSOR INDUSTRY AND SITE

Site	Total Youth Working in For-Profit Sector	Percentage Distribution of Youth Working, by Sponsor Industry[a]							
		Agric., Forestry, Fishing	Construction	Manu-facturing	Transp./ Commun./ Utilities	Wholesale & Retail Trade	Finance, Insurance, Real Estate	Services	Total
TIER I									
Baltimore	463	.2	1.3	16.7	9.7	47.7	6.5	17.9	100.0
Boston	287	.0	2.1	8.0	1.4	28.9	29.6	30.0	100.0
Cincinnati	72	.0	.0	20.8	4.2	47.2	15.3	12.5	100.0
Denver	472	1.1	9.5	23.9	7.0	25.6	8.5	24.4	100.0
Detroit	219	.0	.0	7.8	1.4	33.3	1.4	56.1	100.0
King-Snohomish	5	.0	.0	.0	.0	60.0	.0	40.0	100.0
Mississippi	0								
TOTAL TIER I	1,518	.4	3.8	16.1	5.8	35.2	11.1	27.5	100.0
TIER II									
Alachua County	8	.0	.0	25.0	.0	50.0	12.5	12.5	100.0
Albuquerque	0								
Berkeley	6	.0	.0	16.7	16.7	16.7	.0	50.0	100.0
Dayton	0								
Hillsborough	27	.0	7.4	70.4	.0	7.4	.0	14.8	100.0
Monterey	55	.0	.0	3.7	.0	61.8	1.8	32.7	100.0
New York	1	.0	.0	.0	.0	100.0	.0	.0	100.0
Philadelphia	113	.0	.0	69.9	4.4	7.1	15.9	2.7	100.0
Steuben County	0								
Syracuse	84	.0	.0	13.1	2.4	52.4	8.3	23.8	100.0
TOTAL TIER II	294	.0	.7	38.8	2.7	32.0	9.2	16.6	100.0
TOTAL DEMONSTRATION	1,812	.3	3.3	19.8	5.3	34.7	10.8	25.8	100.0

SOURCE: Tabulations of Monthly Performance Report data in the Youth Entitlement Demonstration Information System.

NOTES: The data cover all recorded job activity in the 17 Sites of the Youth Entitlement Demonstration at the end of June 1978, except for Detroit, where the data relate to the end of May 1978.

Percentage distributions may not add exactly to 100.0 because of rounding.

[a]Industrial categories are based on the divisional groupings of the Standard Industrial Classification Manual (SIC), published by the Executive Office of the President, Office of Management and Budget, in 1972.

TABLE 14

DISTRIBUTION OF YOUTH WORKING IN THE FOR-PROFIT SECTOR
IN THE YOUTH ENTITLEMENT DEMONSTRATION
AT THE END OF JUNE 1978, BY OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORY AND SPONSOR INDUSTRY

Occupational Category[b]	Total Youth Working in For-Profit Sector	Industry of For-Profit Work Sponsor[a]							
		Agric., Forestry, Fishing	Construction	Manu-facturing	Transp./ Commun./ Utilities	Wholesale & Retail Trade	Finance, Insurance, Real Estate	Services	Total
Total Youth Working	1,812	6	59	359	96	629	196	467	1,812
Percentage Distribution of Youth Working by Occupational Category									
Professional, Technical, Managerial	63	.0	.0	3.3	1.0	1.1	1.0	8.8	3.5
Clerical, Sales	800	50.0	17.0	31.8	72.9	56.3	68.4	24.6	44.2
Services	504	.0	.0	11.4	4.2	29.1	21.9	49.9	27.8
Agriculture, Fishery, Forestry	16	50.0	.0	.0	.0	.3	4.6	.4	.9
Processing	3	.0	.0	.3	.0	.3	.0	.0	.2
Machine Trades	66	.0	6.8	7.0	7.3	1.0	.5	4.9	3.6
Benchwork	100	.0	.0	17.6	.0	3.3	.5	3.2	5.5
Structural Work	98	.0	76.3	6.1	.0	1.3	3.1	3.6	5.4
Miscellaneous[c]	162	.0	.0	22.6	14.6	7.3	.0	4.5	8.9
Total	1,812	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

SOURCE: Tabulations of Monthly Performance Report data in the Youth Entitlement Demonstration Information System.

NOTES: The data cover all recorded job activity in the 17 sites of the Youth Entitlement Demonstration at the end of June, 1978, except for Detroit, where the data relate to the end of May 1978.

Percentage distributions may not add exactly to 100.0 because of rounding.

[a]Industrial categories are based on the divisional groupings of the Standard Industrial Classification Manual (SIC), published by the Executive Office of the President, Office of Management and Budget, in 1972.

[b]Occupational Categories are based on the one-digit groupings of the Dictionary of Occupational Titles, Fourth Edition, published by the U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, in 1977.

[c]Includes a wide range of occupations not classified in other DOT categories (motor freight, transportation not elsewhere classified (n.e.c.), packaging and material handling, mineral extraction, production and distribution of utilities, recreation/motion picture/radio/television occupations n.e.c., graphic art work).

Tables 13 and 14 contain more details about private sector worksites.

Training

Although authorized as a paid program component when it is linked to the specific job assignment, training has been little utilized in the demonstration. Twelve of the 17 sites had no paid hours of training, and in only two, Philadelphia and Alachua County, did paid training time exceed five percent of total paid time for the enrollees. The training at those two places, and in Cincinnati, was in the form of "world of work" seminars. There was almost no formalized skills training.

The low utilization of training stems from the fact that Entitlement is primarily a work experience program and the concentration of effort is on developing and placing youths in appropriate work settings. Moreover, most prime sponsors tended to view Entitlement as a year-round SPEDY where the activities are almost wholly work-oriented.

Conclusions

There was an ample supply of jobs for all participating youths through June. These jobs were mostly of the usual variety developed by prime sponsors accustomed to SPEDY-type programs--standard entry-level, public service positions. The public schools are heavily represented as worksites. The proportion of jobs in the private sector was lower than originally projected in the prime sponsors' estimates.

V. RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

The Act and its legislative history make clear that the demonstration is to be carefully assessed for its feasibility and impact, and that reports emanating from the project contain research findings which can offer policy-makers some fresh insights and guidance into the problems of youth unemployment and related social problems.

In section 329 of the Youth Act, Congress has directed the Secretary to report findings on the efficacy of the Entitlement projects with respect to:

"(1) the number of youths enrolled at the time of the report;

"(2) the cost of providing employment opportunities to such youths;

"(3) the degree to which such employment opportunities have caused out-of-school youths to return to school or others to remain in school;

"(4) the number of youths provided employment in relation to the total which might have been eligible;

"(5) the kinds of jobs provided such youths and a description of the employers--public and private--providing such employment;

"(6) the degree to which on-the-job or apprenticeship training has been offered as part of the employment;

"(7) the estimated cost of such a program if it were to be extended to all areas;

"(8) the effect such employment opportunities have had on reducing youth unemployment in the areas of the prime sponsors operating a project; and

"(9) the impact of job opportunities provided under the project on other job opportunities for youth in the area."

Additional research concerns can be inferred from the Statement of Purpose to the demonstration projects Title of the Act (section 321):

> "(10) It is explicitly not the purpose of this part to provide makework opportunities for unemployed youths; instead, it is the purpose to provide youth...with opportunities to learn and earn that will lead to meaningful employment opportunities after they have completed the program."

Finally, the Act specifies Congressional interest in understanding the importance of the service delivery system for implementing Entitlement, with a statement that the purpose of the demonstration projects shall be:

> "(11) to test the relative efficacy of different ways of dealing with these problems in local contexts... (section 321), and by providing for tests of a variety of administrative mechanisms to facilitate the employment of youths under an entitlement arrangement...' (section 327 (b))."

The research program for the Youth Entitlement Demonstration has three major components. The impact analysis will measure participation rates of eligible youths in the program and will assess the program's impacts on labor force participation, employment and earnings, and schooling attendance and completion. The cost analysis will measure program costs and attempt, on the basis of participation and cost data, to estimate the costs of the program if it were implemented nationwide. The implementation analysis will study the administrative, operational, and institutional issues in the program's implementation. Each of these areas is discussed below.

Impact Analysis

The impact analysis will address the following issues and hypotheses. Numbers in parentheses refer to the Congressionally-mandated questions listed above.

Participation rate of eligible youths (1,4).

-- What proportion of eligible youths enroll in the demonstration?

-- What are the socio-economic-demographic characteristics of participants?

-- How do participants compare to non-participants?

-- What program design and environmental factors explain participation?

Short-term educational attainment and school performance (3).

-- What is the impact of Entitlement on the performance of students already enrolled in school and on their retention in school?

-- What is the impact of Entitlement on the return to high school or GED programs by former high school drop-outs, and their performance in such programs?

Short-term impacts on employment, unemployment, and labor-force participation of poor youths (8).

-- What is the impact of Entitlement on the employment and unemployment rates of students?

-- What is the impact of Entitlement on the employment and unemployment rates of former drop-outs?

Longer-term impacts on earnings, post-secondary education, and expectations (10).

-- What is the impact of Entitlement on the post-high school earnings of students and former drop-outs?

-- What is the impact of Entitlement on the college entrance rates of students and former drop-outs?

-- What is the impact of Entitlement on participant expectations?

Effects on the labor market for non-poor youths (8,9).

The data for the measurement of participation rates and the assessment of program impacts on youths will be obtained from four waves of interviews with a random household sample of eligible youths and their parents in four Entitlement sites and four matched non-Entitlement sites. The four Entitlement sites are Denver, Cincinnati, Baltimore, and a part of the Entitlement area in rural Mississippi. The four control sites are Phoenix, Louisville, Cleveland, and several non-Entitlement counties in Mississippi. The baseline survey was subcontracted by MDRC to Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. The refinement of the design and the analysis of the data was subcontracted to Abt Associates, Inc.

The first survey wave was conducted in the spring and summer of 1978. A baseline interview to establish employment and schooling history was administered to a random household sample of Entitlement-eligible youths in all four demonstration sites and all four matched comparison communities. The eligible youths were identified through a screening interview administered to a stratified random sample of households, which established eligibility on the same basis as the program.

The sample consists of 7,553 youths of which 5,184 are in the demonstration sites and 2,369 in the control sites. Of the 7,553, 6,166 youths are in the urban sites, demonstration and control, and

1,387 in rural Mississippi.

In order to obtain that sample, over 130,000 households were screened. The schedule for the baseline survey called for the beginning of screening interviews in mid-February, 1978 and the conclusion of baseline interviews by the end of March. Despite the extremely short period available for preparations between approval of the research design in late November and the planned start of the survey, the screening did begin approximately on schedule in the four Entitlement sites between February 23 and March 2, and in the comparison sites by March 9. Substantial delays were encountered, however, in processing the eligibility date and getting the baseline interviews underway, and the baseline survey was not completed until the end of July. The delay in completing the surveys and in delivering a clean data tape for analysis to the research subcontractor has delayed the availability of baseline data. That tape was not delivered until the last week in October, too late for the contents to be analyzed and reported in time for inclusion in this report. A report on the baseline sample is scheduled for February, 1979.

Cost Analysis

The cost analysis, to be conducted by MDRC, will address issues (2) and (7) in the Congressional list of questions. Data will be drawn from the Entitlement fiscal reporting and information systems that have been designed and are being managed by MDRC. Data from these systems will be used to determine total program costs, costs per participant,

and costs per participant-year for different subgroups of youths. These unit-cost measures, combined with the sample survey estimates of program participation for the different groups of youths, will be used to estimate the cost of extending Entitlement to all areas of the country.

Implementation Analysis

The purpose of the implementation analysis is to understand and explain the programmatic development of the Entitlement Demonstration at the sites and draw lessons concerning the demonstration's operational feasibility, both generally and under varying site circumstances. Although there is a basic program design for Entitlement under the management of CETA prime sponsors, there is considerable variation across sites in the administrative arrangements established for operating the program. The implementation analysis is examining the influence of these varying institutional arrangements, processes, and decisions on the program's development, as well as local, political, social, and economic factors that may also affect the way in which Entitlement operates.

The general research on the implementation of Entitlement will cover a number of key areas. For each area, the corresponding question is indicated in parentheses.

-- Description of Program Contents and Operations (1), (5), (6).

-- Implementation Factors Affecting the Enrollment of the Eligible Youths and their Continued Participation in the Program (4).

-- Institutional and Programmatic Relationships between the Prime Sponsors and the Schools Attended by Entitlement Youths (11).

-- Adaptability of CETA to the Requirements of Operating a Job Entitlement Program (11).

-- The Innovative Programs Undertaken by the Smaller Tier II Sites (5), (6).

-- The Role Played by the Private Sector in Hiring Entitlement Youths and Incentives and Barriers to Private Sector Participation in the Job Guarantee (5), (6).

-- Implementation of Entitlement in Rural Areas (5), (6), (11).

-- Content and Quality of the Entitlement Worksites (10).

The data sources for the implementation analysis are varied. Quantitative data on the characteristics of participants in the programs, their status (enrolled, on hold, at work, or terminated), the types of work to which they are assigned, the employers that provide it, and on participant wages and hours, is produced by an Entitlement Information System (EIS) established by MDRC. On-site program monitors at the Tier I sites and centrally-based field representatives to all 17 projects provide narrative descriptive research reports on program content and activity. These are assigned periodically, and are based on structured report guides designed to obtain comparable data across the sites. Reports from the monitors and field representatives--prepared for program management purposes--also inform the implementation analysis. Lastly, interviews with program officials and other knowledgeable observers of the projects at the Tier I sites provide data on the factors that are affecting program implementation and shaping the content and operation of the projects.

The timetable for further development of the research effort and the

schedule of reports due from MDRC and its subcontractors is on the following page.

CHART I

SCHEDULE FOR RESEARCH REPORTS

REPORT	ISSUES COVERED	DATE
Status Report on Demonstration to date	Planning and site selection	March, 1978
Entitlement Demonstration: First Six Months January-June, 1978	Start-up experience	December, 1978
Report on the Baseline Survey: Pilot and Comparison sites	Characteristics of the sample	February, 1979
Implementation of Entitlement through September, 1978	Implementation issues: participation recruitment and enrollment jobs and hours worksites schooling	March, 1979
Preliminary Report on Participation Rates and Return to School and School Drop-out Rates	Participation rates of the baseline sample in the pilot sites through December, 1978 Return to school and School Drop-out Rates	November, 1979
Implementation of Entitlement through September, 1979	Implementation issues	March, 1980
Report on In-Program Impacts through Summer, 1979	Participation rates Employment impacts Schooling impacts	April, 1980
Entitlement in Rural Areas	Implementation and participation issues in Mississippi and selected Tier II rural programs	June, 1980
Private Sector Participation in Entitlement	Issues of private sector involvement in the demonstration	June, 1980
Quality of Work	Assessment of nature and quality of jobs provided	September, 1980

CHART I
(continued)

REPORT	ISSUES COVERED	DATE
Report on In-and Post-Program Impacts through June, 1980	Participation rates Employment impact Schooling impacts including return to school and school drop-out rates	April, 1981
Final Implementation Research Report	Implementation issues	December, 1981
Final Report on In-and Post-Program Impacts	Post-program impacts through 9/82	April, 1982
Summary Report on the Demonstration		June, 1982

VI. FUNDING ENTITLEMENT

Site Funding Amounts

The total demonstration funding for the 17 sites' programs was $138 million for the initial 18-month period. Of this, $108 million was in grants out of the Entitlement national appropriation. The remaining 21 percent or $30 million, was provided by the participating prime sponsors from their regular CETA allocations, primarily Title III SPEDY funds. Total budgets and Entitlement shares are shown in Table 15.

Table 16 shows the allocation of total budgets into the four principal budget categories and actual percentages through June 30. Wages and benefits for the enrolled youth were budgeted at about 71 percent of the total, and accounted for 50 percent through June 30. Worksite supervision and related expenses were budgeted at 7.1 percent, reflecting the fact that most of this activity is furnished without cost by the participating worksites, and amounted to 7.7 percent through June 30. The program management category, budgeted at 18.9 percent and representing 41 percent as of June 30, includes counselors, recruiters, intake workers, and job developers as well as administrative personnel.

Actual spending through June 30 was $14 million, or 41.2 percent of the $34 million total budgeted for this period. Of the $14 million, nearly $11 million were Entitlement funds and the balance was from other prime sponsor resources. See Table 17. This indicates mainly overestimates of funding needs, as suggested in Chapter 3 of this report, and the usual start-up delays. Table 18 summarizes total expenditures for the demonstration through June 30.

TABLE 15

TOTAL SITE BUDGET FOR THE ENTITLEMENT DEMONSTRATION
FOR THE PERIOD JANUARY 1 1978 THROUGH JUNE 30 1979, BY SITE

Site	Total Approved Budget ($)	Entitlement Funds ($)	Percent Entitlement Of Total Budget
TIER I			
Baltimore	30,723,784	23,000,000	74.9
Boston	10,908,963	8,512,104	78.0
Cincinnati	13,602,508	12,302,530	90.4
Denver	15,687,976	13,279,596	84.6
Detroit	11,434,257	8,500,000	74.3
King-Snohomish	14,582,973	11,781,500	80.8
Mississippi	24,251,232	20,805,816	85.8
TOTAL TIER I	121,191,693	98,181,546	81.0
TIER II			
Alachua County	1,371,335	1,075,000	78.4
Albuquerque	1,208,800	1,106,000	91.5
Berkeley	2,869,983	1,250,000	43.6
Dayton	750,000	750,000	100.0
Hillsborough	1,260,692	950,000	75.4
Monterey	950,000	950,000	100.0
New York	1,630,563	954,217	58.5
Philadelphia	1,912,714	1,089,738	57.0
Steuben County	1,527,709	1,024,197	67.0
Syracuse	3,431,430	1,208,157	35.2
TOTAL TIER II	16,913,226	10,357,309	61.2
TOTAL DEMONSTRATION	138,104,919	108,538,855	78.6

SOURCE: Existing Site Grant Agreement budgets.

TABLE 16

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF BUDGETED AND ACTUAL SITE EXPENSES
IN THE ENTITLEMENT DEMONSTRATION
BY MAJOR EXPENSE CATEGORY AND TIER

	Percentage Distribution by Major Expense Category				
	Participant Wages And Benefits	Program Management	Worksite Supervision And Expense	Training	Total
TIER I					
Approved Budget for the 18-Month Period January 1, 1978 Through June 30, 1979	71.9	17.7	7.4	3.0	100.0
Actual Expenses for the 6-Month Period January 1, 1978 Through June 30, 1978	50.7	39.8	8.2	1.3	100.0
TIER II					
Approved Budget for the 18-Month Period January 1, 1978 Through June 30, 1979	64.1	27.3	5.0	3.6	100.0
Actual Expenses for the 6-Month Period January 1, 1978 Through June 30, 1978	42.3	49.6	4.0	4.1	100.0
TOTAL DEMONSTRATION					
Approved Budget for the 18-Month Period January 1, 1978 Through June 30, 1979	70.9	18.9	7.1	3.1	100.0
Actual Expenses for the 6-Month Period January 1, 1978 Through June 30, 1978	49.7	41.0	7.7	1.6	100.0

SOURCE: Existing Site Grant Agreement budgets and Combined Operating Reports.

TABLE 17

TOTAL BUDGETED AND ACTUAL SITE EXPENSES
IN THE ENTITLEMENT DEMONSTRATION
FOR THE PERIOD JANUARY 1 1978 THROUGH JUNE 30 1978, BY SITE

Site	Total Approved Budget ($)	Actual Expenses ($)	Percent Actual Of Budgeted
TIER I			
Baltimore	6,309,000	4,818,800	76.4
Boston	4,247,000	2,133,653	50.2
Cincinnati	3,209,000	639,339	19.9
Denver	3,498,000	1,410,742	40.3
Detroit	5,207,000	1,093,491	21.0
King-Snohomish	1,748,408	651,154	37.2
Mississippi	6,350,200	1,524,908	24.0
TOTAL TIER I	30,568,608	12,272,087	40.1
TIER II			
Alachua County	273,000	142,338	52.1
Albuquerque	222,900	251,290	112.7
Berkeley	495,500	280,677	56.6
Dayton	165,300	39,250	23.7
Hillsborough	157,835	55,861	35.4
Monterey	266,500	83,758	31.4
New York	357,000	126,744	35.5
Philadelphia	448,000	257,833	57.6
Steuben County	298,500	113,962	38.2
Syracuse	784,200	403,320	51.4
TOTAL TIER II	3,468,735	1,755,033	50.6
TOTAL DEMONSTRATION	34,037,343	14,027,120	41.2
Entitlement Funds		10,901,705	32.0
Non-Entitlement Funds		3,125,415	9.2

SOURCE: Existing Site Grant Agreement budgets and Combined Operating Reports.

TABLE 18

SUMMARY OF TOTAL EXPENDITURES
FOR THE YOUTH ENTITLEMENT DEMONSTRATION
THROUGH JUNE 30, 1978

	Actual Expenses ($)	Budgeted ($)
MDRC	817,912	1,772,500
Program Contractors	2,613,957	3,797,145
Site Operations	14,027,120	34,037,343
TOTAL	17,458,989	39,606,988

SOURCE: MDRC Fiscal Reports and site Combined Operating Reports.

NOTES: Amounts shown in expenditure and budget columns for MDRC and Program Contractors cover the period August 1, 1977 through June 30, 1978, while site operations amounts cover the period January 1, 1978 through June 30, 1978. Program contractor costs include all expenses for program consultants, research subcontractors, information system computer services, and legal and accounting services. Research and computer costs, the largest category, were nearly $2.5 million.

APPENDIX

SITE PROFILES

CONTENTS

Profiles of the 17 Entitlement sites, arranged alphabetically by name

Site	Tier	Page
Alachua County (Gainesville), Florida	II	37
Albuquerque, New Mexico	II	38
Baltimore, Maryland	I	39
Berkeley, California	II	40
Boston, Massachusetts	I	41
Cincinnati, Ohio	I	42
Denver, Colorado	I	43
Detroit, Michigan	I	44
Hillsborough County/Nashua, New Hampshire	II	45
King-Snohomish (Seattle) Manpower Consortium, Washington	I	46
Miami Valley/Dayton, Ohio	II	47
Mississippi (Rural)	I	48
Monterey County, California	II	49
New York City, New York	II	50
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	II	51
Steuben County, New York	II	52
Syracuse, New York	II	53

Alachua County, Florida (Tier II)

Alachua County, in north-central Florida, has as its Entitlement area the adjoining school districts of Eastside and Hawthorne high schools, which cover about one-half of the city of Gainesville and one-third of mostly rural Alachua County. Entitlement is managed by the prime sponsor. The prime sponsor contracts with the County School Board for assistance in monitoring enrollment, attendance, and academic performance, and for conducting outreach for drop-outs as well as in-school youths. Informal agreements exist with the Employment Service, Social and Economic Services, and Division for Youth Services for placement of departing seniors, welfare verification, and referral of youths in the juvenile justice system, respectively.

As of June 30, Alachua had enrolled 192 youths, all of whom had been either in school or a GED program during the prior semester. Ninety-three percent of the enrollees were Black, and 16 percent were receiving cash welfare. As in most sites, females slightly out-numbered males. Of the job assignments, 61 percent were working for a public education institution and 33 percent were working for some other public agency. Almost one-half the work assignments were in service-type occupations.

Alachua proposed three formal innovative features in the Entitlement program: 1) a 20-hour orientation course which features testing and assessment, vocational exploration, employability planning, and nutritional guidance; 2) special outreach and referral services for youths involved with the juvenile justice system; and 3) OJT slots in the private sector. The County has also developed a peer counseling

component.

In the Gainesville area, jobs in both the public and private sectors have been relatively plentiful. The University of Florida, located in Gainesville, has offered a wide variety of job opportunities for Entitlement and the youth program participants.

In the sparsely populated rural area of Hawthorne, on the other hand, job development in both public and private sectors has been difficult. Two public agencies in the area have agreed to participate, and the relatively small number of small-sized businesses has limited OJT opportunities. The public agencies have had a difficult time designing jobs other than custodial or groundskeeping positions, and have experienced problems keeping youths productively engaged. Matching participant interests with available jobs has also been slow in Hawthorne.

Albuquerque, New Mexico (Tier II)

The Albuquerque Entitlement area consists of the Albuquerque High School District, a large and widespread geographical area with approximately 35,000 residents living in neighborhoods ranging from extreme poverty to affluence.

The prime sponsor is the City of Albuquerque-Bernalillo County Consortium. The bulk of youth program operations, including Entitlement, are sub-contracted to the Albuquerque school system.

As of June 30, Albuquerque had enrolled 436 youths, all except 17 of whom had been in school or a GED program during the prior semester. Seventy-eight percent were Hispanic, 17 percent Black, and 31 percent

were receiving cash welfare. Of the job assignments, about one-half were in public education institutions and about as many were in other public agencies. About 40 percent of the work assignments were in clerical-sales occupations, and another 40 percent in service fields.

An innovative feature is to guarantee teenage parents a job, coupled with supportive services provided by the New Futures School, a nationally-recognized program of the Albuquerque school system. Another special feature is an occupational and career training program which combines a weekly career guidance class with actual work experience to provide academic credit to Entitlement participants. Many of the 61 Entitlement graduates this year would not have had enough graduation credits without this component.

The two major providers of worksites are the University of New Mexico and Kirtland Air Force Base. Both institutions have been previously involved in youth programs and are supportive of Entitlement.

Students prefer working at the university because it is located near Albuquerque High. Transportation to Kirtland AFB is more difficult. Insurance requirements make it impractical to take a private car onto the base, and use of the public bus frequently takes close to two hours from the high school to Kirtland. To overcome this, staff is assessing the feasibility of a charter bus service between the high school and the base.

Baltimore (Tier I)

The Entitlement project in Baltimore covers a large portion of the city's central downtown area which contains over 60 percent of the city's

economically disadvantaged youths. It is operated by the Mayor's Office of Manpower Resources (MOMR), the consortium prime sponsor serving the city of Baltimore and five surrounding counties. In setting up the Entitlement program, MOMR turned first to its regular SPEDY and youth partners, the schools and community-based organizations, to provide educational alternatives and worksites. These subcontractors include:

-- Baltimore City Public Schools, which provide alternative learning opportunities for 1,240 youths;

-- Mayors Advisory Council on Arts and Culture, which furnishes worksites and training in the arts;

-- Baltimore Urban League, which has GED slots for 50 out-of-school youths;

-- Communities Organized to Improve Life, also with 50 GED slots for out-of-school youths;

-- Community College of Baltimore, with 200 slots for vocational education, work and GED training;

-- State of Maryland Management Development Center, training for worksite supervisors; and

-- Housing Authority of Baltimore City, 1,084 worksites for Entitlement youths.

As of June 30, Baltimore had enrolled 7,594 youths, of whom 89 percent had been in high school or a GED program during the preceding semester. Blacks comprised 98 percent of the enrollees; 52 percent of the enrollees were receiving cash welfare, and 18 percent had dropped out of school for a semester or more. Of the job assignments, just under one-half were in a non-education public agency and one-quarter were in nonprofit organizations. Over 80 percent of the jobs were in roughly even amounts among professional-technical, clerical-sales, and service occupations.

Berkeley, California (Tier II)

The Entitlement area is the entire city, and the program is operated through the city's prime sponsor, the Office of Employment and Community Programs, in cooperation with the public school district.

As of June 30, Berkeley had enrolled 510 youths, 98 percent of whom had been in high school during the prior semester. Eighty percent of the enrollees were Black, seven percent were Hispanic, and 42 percent were receiving cash welfare. Of the work assignments, just under one-half were in public education institutions, and one-third were in nonprofit organizations. Most of the jobs were in service occupations (42 percent) and clerical-sales (39 percent).

An innovation in Berkeley is the Participant Performance Agreement, which states the minimum academic, attendance, and work performance standards required by the program. It is signed by the youth and his or her counselor. Periodically thereafter they evaluate the youth's performance against the agreement, at which point the youth may be referred for a job change, further skills assessment, or counseling.

A second innovation is a series of assessments which are given to youths before placement. These include a physical examination and a three-hour visit to the career center where reading and math skills are are tested, and three in-depth career and personal skills inventories are taken under the guidance of a counselor.

Proposition 13 caused a loss of 300 public sector work slots which took six weeks to recoup. The overall fiscal and management difficulties caused by Proposition 13 led Berkeley to postpone development of its

proposed private sector worksite plan until next year.

Boston, Massachusetts (Tier I)

The Entitlement area is made up of four school districts, Numbers 4 through 7, comprising portions of the neighborhoods generally known as Dorchester, South Boston, Charlestown, Central Boston, the South End, the North End, Beacon Hill, Back Bay, Mattapan, Hyde Park, and parts of Roxbury. About one-half of Boston's 16-19 year-olds live in this area. The program is administered by the city's prime sponsor, the Employment and Economic Policy Administration. The local community action agency, ABCD, and the Boston Public Schools, are major participants.

As of June 30, Boston had enrolled 4,288 youths, 97 percent of whom had been in school or a GED program during the prior semester. Unlike most sites, Boston's enrollment had a slight majority of males. Fifty-three percent were Black, and 45 percent were receiving cash welfare payments. Of the job assignments, 43 percent were in a non-education public agency and 35 percent were in a nonprofit organization. About 70 percent of the jobs were in either clerical-sales or services occupations.

Initially Boston concentrated on the in-school youth population, relying heavily on the school system. The out-of-school recruitment was slow, and new steps have been taken to enhance recruitment. The Youth Activities Commission has detailed youth workers to recruit on the streets and ABCD's contract was increased for outreach of out-of-school youths. Mobile vans have also been deployed in the Entitlement

area. In addition, Boston has devised a plan to create educational alternatives for out-of-school enrollees. Boston has restructured project organization to meet some early operational problems such as slow response to demonstration data needs.

Cincinnati, Ohio (Tier I)

The entire city is the Entitlement area, and is administered by the city's Employment and Training Division with the assistance of six subcontractors:

-- Cincinnati Public Schools, for intake and placement of approximately 2,300 in-school youths and worksites in the public and private, nonprofit sectors;

-- Cincinnati Institute of Justice, for intake, placement, and counseling of 300 youths connected with the juvenile justice system. CIJ also develops worksites;

-- Citizen's Committee on Youth, for intake, placement, and counseling of 310 out of school youths;

-- Greater Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce, for placement of approximately 450-600 participants on private, for-profit worksites;

-- Ohio Council 8, a municipal union, for job descriptions and letters of agreement from worksite sponsors for all youths placed in their jurisdiction, and monitoring worksites daily;

-- Community Chest, for developing worksites in the private, nonprofit sector, generally agencies of the organization.

As of June 30, Cincinnati had enrolled 2,241 youths, 93 percent of whom had been in school or a GED program during the preceding semester. Ninety-one percent were Black, and one-half were receiving cash welfare payments. Of the job assignments, 57 percent were in nonprofit organizations, which is over twice as high as the comparable figure for the

demonstration overall. The largest single occupational category was service, which had nearly 40 percent of the youths who had been assigned. Professional-technical and clerical-sales categories each had 20 percent of the enrollees who were working as of the end of June.

In the months ahead, major emphasis will be on greater placement in private sector worksites and reduction of subsidy, improved procedures for monitoring worksites, greater coordination of work and school programs to maximize learning experience, and integration of Entitlement with other youth employment programs.

Denver, Colorado (Tier I)

The Denver Entitlement Program encompasses the entire City and County of Denver. The local prime sponsor agency, the Denver Employment and Training Administration, serves as the project's managing agent and has let four subcontracts for significant areas of program operation:

-- National Alliance of Businessmen, for placement of about 700 youths in private sector worksites;

-- Denver Public Schools, for special services and pilot projects serving in-school youths;

-- Opportunities Industrialization Center, for recruitment and GED programs for out-of-school youths;

-- SER-Jobs for Progress, for recruitment and GED programs for out-of-school youths.

As of June 30, Denver had enrolled 2,589 youths, 90 percent of whom had been in school or a GED program during the prior semester. Denver's enrollment was 44 percent Hispanic, by far the greatest total number in

the overall demonstration and the highest percentage share among the Tier I sites. Another 40 percent of the enrollees were Black, 30 percent of the total were receiving cash welfare payments, and 20 percent had dropped out of school for a semester or more. Of the job assignments, 30 percent were in private, for-profit firms, by far the greatest number in the demonstration, where the overall percentage was 10 percent. Nearly 35 percent of Denver's worksites were in non-school public agencies, and another 25 percent were in nonprofit organizations. The largest share of jobs, 32 percent were of the public service aide type, and nearly 30 percent were clerical-sales.

Several start-up problems in Denver are now being corrected. Greater attention will be paid to: recruitment of out-of-school youths, closer monitoring of sub-contract operations, transition services for departing enrollees, and staff training.

Detroit, Michigan (Tier I)

The Entitlement area is five contiguous public school districts in central downtown Detroit, where the school drop-out rate is over 50 percent. The project is operated by the city's Manpower Department, which is Detroit's prime sponsor.

As of June 30, Detroit had enrolled 3,975 youths, 97 percent of whom had been in school or GED during the preceding semester. Detroit's enrollment was 92 percent Black, and 45 percent were receiving cash welfare payments. Of the job assignments, almost one-half were in public education institutions. Twenty-six percent, or over 2.5 times

the overall rate for the demonstration, were in the private, for-profit sector. The smallest proportion in all the Tier I sites, 12.4 percent were in nonprofit organizations. Over one-half the assigned youths were doing clerical-sales work and another 43 percent were in service-type occupations.

Detroit's activities now are emphasizing a restructuring of certain program responsibilities, increased recruitment of out-of-school youths, improvements in payroll and other management systems, renegotiation of school performance and attendance standards, straightening out lines of responsibility among cooperating agencies, and negotiation of contracts with community-based organizations for alternative education services.

Hillsborough County/Nashua, New Hampshire (Tier II)

The Entitlement area encompasses Nashua, which is a small industrialized city in southern New Hampshire. The Entitlement program is administered by Southern New Hampshire Services (SNHS), a private, nonprofit organization. Nashua is a relatively tight labor market area, a fact that has a negative effect on the program's recruitment efforts.

As of June 30, Hillsborough had enrolled 100 youths, all but 11 of whom had been in school or a GED program during the prior semester. Hillsborough's enrollment was 95 percent White; 26 percent were receiving cash welfare payments and 21 percent had dropped out of school for a semester or more. Almost all the job assignments were in the private sector, with 47 percent in nonprofit and 46 percent in for-profit organizations. Over 40 percent of the work was clerical-sales, and 18

percent and 16 percent, respectively, were in professional-technical and service occupations.

Hillsborough's planned innovations are private sector involvement and vocational training. The private sector involvement has been thoroughly integrated into the program through the use of the Chamber of Commerce as the job developer.

King-Snohomish (Seattle), Washington (Tier I)

The Entitlement program operates throughout the two counties of King and Snohomish, which constitute a single labor market area and include the city of Seattle. This area encompasses nearly 4,300 square miles with a total estimated population of about 1.4 million, one-third of whom live in Seattle.

The managing agency is the King-Snohomish Manpower Consortium (KSMC), a public agency established and governed by elected officials representing the nine local governments in the two-county area. Students enrolled in a total of 115 public and private schools in 33 independent school districts in King and Snohomish Counties are eligible.

The Entitlement program is delegated to five other agencies, each of which conducts virtually self-contained segments of the program for youths who reside in their respective areas. These agencies are: the Seattle Public Schools; the City of Seattle; King County; Everett School District #2; and Community Action of Snohomish County.

As of June 30, KSMC had enrolled 1,783 youths, 96 percent of whom had been in school or a GED program during the prior semester. Over one-

half the enrollees were non-Hispanic Whites. This represents the largest number in any of the demonstration sites. Twenty-nine percent of the enrollees were Black, and 11 percent were Asian/Pacific Islander. The highest percentage of any site, 56 percent, were receiving cash welfare. Of the work assignments, the largest share, 37 percent, were in public education institutions, 33 percent were in other public agencies, and 28 percent were in nonprofit organizations. Only five youths were working in the for-profit sector. In line with overall demonstration figures, over three-quarters of the work was in three categories: public service aides, clerical-sales, and service jobs.

Several problems delayed start-up at KSMC, and despite an extensive mass media recruitment campaign, initial enrollments have lagged. According to the prime sponsor, a responsible factor has been greater relative attractiveness of alternative youth employment programs. Future activities will give priority to increasing out-of-school enrollments and services, and enhanced educational alternatives sponsored by community-based organizations.

Miami Valley/Dayton, Ohio (Tier II)

This program is the smallest of the 17 sites, consisting of one census tract. The managing agency is the Dayton Public Schools; the prime sponsorship -- originally the Miami Valley Manpower Consortium-- was changed to the City of Dayton October 1, 1978.

As of June 30, Dayton had enrolled only 46 youths, all except two of whom had been in school or a GED program during the prior semester.

All the youths were Black, two-thirds of the job assignments were in nonprofit organizations, and 88 percent of the youths were working in service-type jobs.

Dayton's innovation is the OJT component which calls for 20 slots to be developed in the private sector with a 50 percent subsidy of participant wages. Non-college bound enrollees who can graduate from high school within the time of the program are eligible for the OJT slots, and employers must agree to offer these youths jobs at the end of the program if their performance has been satisfactory. However, as of June 30, no placements under this program had been made. The Dayton program has been disappointing, hampered by under-enrollment and the disintegration of the prime sponsor consortium which was the original Entitlement sponsor.

Rural Mississippi (Tier I)

The Mississippi Entitlement program operates in a 19-county area extending horizontally across the southern portion of the state. The prime sponsor is the Governor's Office of Job Development and Training, which acts as prime sponsor for 70 counties in the Mississippi Balance of State CETA area. Major subcontractors, which are the day-to-day program operators of Entitlement, are:

-- The University of Southern Mississippi, which coordinates the 28 separate school districts involved in Entitlement and operates alternative education centers;

-- The Mississippi Employment Security Commission, which performs enrollments, placements, wage processing, and worksite development;

-- Four community-based organizations, each with its own

geographic area, which provide outreach, recruitment, and some worksite supervision and liaison with the school system.

As of June 30, Mississippi had enrolled 4,320 youth, 98 percent of whom had been in school or a GED program the preceding semester. Eighty-four percent of the enrollees were Black, and 23 percent were receiving cash welfare payments. About 85 percent of the work assignments were in a public agency, roughly half of which were in schools. The largest portion of youths, 36 percent were doing service work, and an unusually high 30 percent were in DOT's structural category.

Start-up problems included slow development of alternative education centers, lack of adequate transportation in this sparsely-populated area, and lack of child care services for those youths with their own children. There were also organizational disputes which hampered program implementation. These difficulties, except for transportation, are now well on their way to resolution.

Monterey County, California (Tier II)

The Entitlement area is the rural Gonzales Union High School District, in the Salinas Valley of Monterey County, comprising the towns of Soledad, Gonzalez, and Chular. The project is managed by the County Office of Education's Youth Corps, which also manages other youth work experience programs.

As of June 30, Monterey had enrolled a total of 169 youths, 92 percent of whom had been in school or a GED program during the prior semester. Reflecting the population of the area, 89 percent of the enrollees

were Hispanic. Cash welfare was being received by 38 percent. Of the work assignments, 62.5 percent were in the private, for-profit sector and the balance were in public agencies. One-half the work was of the clerical-sales variety, and 20 percent was in service-type occupations.

The chief innovative feature planned for the program was to help migrant youths break the "migrant cycle" through prolonged education and earnings from part-time employment. Attraction of migrant youths has not worked as planned: only two were ever enrolled in the program. One explanation for this seems to be changing migrant trends in this heavily unionized agricultural area. Minimum farm wages are $3.00 per hour as compared with $2.65 for Entitlement. Migration of whole families is diminishing, crops were good this year, and work relatively plentiful.

Proposition 13 created a shortage of worksites in the public sector for all of Monterey CETA. As a result, the Entitlement program agreed to place its participants mainly in private sector worksites, thereby freeing-up remaining public sector worksites for other CETA programs which cannot utilize the private sector.

New York, New York (Tier II)

New York City's Entitlement area is most of the Wingate High School zone in the Crown Heights section of Brooklyn. The managing agency is the City Department of Employment, and the area's community organizations are also involved.

As of June 30, New York had enrolled 399 youths, all of whom had been in school or a GED program during the prior semester. Ninety-three

percent of the enrollees were Black, and 25 percent were receiving cash welfare payments. A higher-than-average percentage, 61 percent were female. All the job assignments were in private organizations, 80 percent in nonprofits and 20 percent in the for-profit sector. Eighty percent of the work was in the clerical-sales category.

Innovations are private sector participation, involving the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce and Better Business Bureau, and a special program for single parents which has enrolled 15 students. The program has also received an HEW grant to set up an infant care center for the children of these enrollees.

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania (Tier II)

The Entitlement area is School District 4, located in the low-income North Philadelphia section, which has a very high unemployment rate among Black youths. The program is sponsored by the prime sponsor, the City's Area Manpower Planning Council, and is administered by the Philadelphia Public Schools. The private, nonprofit Council for Revitalization of Employment and Industry provides job development, placement, and supervision.

As of June 30, Philadelphia had enrolled 205 youths, all of whom had been in high school during the preceding semester. Like New York City, there was an unusually heavy majority female enrollment, which stood at 63 percent--the highest in the demonstration--on June 30. All the enrollees were Black, and 28 percent were receiving cash welfare.

Philadelphia had the highest percentage of private, for-profit

worksites in the demonstration, 70 percent, and about one-half of these were in union shops. This is testimony to the active involvement of private business and labor in the Philadelphia project. Another 20 percent were in nonprofit organizations. Clerical-sales jobs accounted for 42 percent of the work assignments, and service jobs another 18 percent.

Among the most active labor unions have been the ILGWU, Amalgamated Clothing Workers, Steelworkers, Paper Converters, United Auto Workers, Graphic Arts and AFL-CIO. Local unions have agreed to monitor the program to prevent substitution of regular union employees with Entitlement participants. The credibility of the aforementioned civic council has been crucial in obtaining union cooperation. At this time, no Entitlement youths have entered apprenticeship positions, but one person is in a pre-apprenticeship program. Such exposure will very likely include a certain amount of union indoctrination as Entitlement participants work beside union members.

Steuben County, New York (Tier II)

The Entitlement area includes 11 townships with seven school districts in a sparsely populated rural farming area in southwestern New York. The project is administered by the Steuben County CETA office, with subcontract assistance from the State Employment Service, a local community action agency, State Bureau of Cooperative Educational Services, and Program Funding, Inc. Important worksite agencies are Corning Community College and the State Department of Environmental

Conservation.

As of June 30, Steuben had enrolled 95 youths, second lowest in the demonstration, 18 percent of whom--the highest percentage in the demonstration--had been out of school the prior semester. Reflecting the composition of the area, all but two enrollees were White. Only four percent received cash welfare payments, and 34 percent had dropped out of school for a semester or longer. Non-education public agencies employed 80 percent of the youths, with another 20 percent in nonprofit organizations. The preponderance of work was in the agriculture-fishery-forestry category, which had 80 percent of the youths who were working as of June 30.

Steuben County is an economically depressed rural area, with limited job and training prospects. Because of a desire to create an attractive program, Steuben decided to develop a highly innovative project which would focus on changing participants' attitudes towards themselves and the world of work and impart positive values in these areas. All of the worksites, save forestry and the construction of a proposed 180-seat outdoor amphitheater, are artistic and creative in nature and include painting and pottery, sociodrama and theater work. As in other rural areas, transportation is a large handicap to efficient program administration.

Syracuse, New York (Tier II)

Syracuse's Entitlement area is the entire city, and the project is operated by the city's Office of Federal and State Aid Coordinator.

There is no major subcontractor, although there is a close working relationship with the Syracuse Public Schools.

As of June 30, Syracuse had enrolled 805 youths, by far the highest number among the Tier II sites. Of the enrollees, all but two percent had been in school or a GED program the prior semester. Seventy-one percent of the enrollees were Black, 50 percent were receiving cash welfare--the highest percentage among Tier II sites, and third highest among all 17 demonstration sites. Of the job assignments, the largest share, 36 percent, were in nonprofit organizations. Public agencies other than schools employed 26 percent, and 20 percent were in the private, for-profit sector. Clerical-sales occupations accounted for 37 percent of the workers, and 28 percent and 22 percent, respectively, were in service and professional-technical kinds of jobs.

Entitlement provides an expanded youth employment program, operating through the existing youth employment structure. Innovative approaches include services to teenage parents and juvenile offenders. A major emphasis is placed on the development of worksites in the private, for-profit sector.

The close working relationship with the school district has helped identification and recruitment of in-school youths and drop-outs. In addition to regular school district programs for returning school drop-outs, a GED center, Adult Basic Education Center, and Educational Opportunity Centers also serve the population.

"END OF DOCUMENT"